arXiv:1605.08597v1 [math.CO] 27 May 2016

Analytic combinatorics of connected graphs*

Élie de Panafieu†
Bell Labs France, Nokia

May 30, 2016

Abstract

We enumerate the connected graphs that contain a linear number of edges with respect to the number of vertices. So far, only first term of the asymptotics and a bound on the error were known. Using analytic combinatorics, *i.e.* generating function manipulations, we derive the complete asymptotic expansion.
keywords. connected graphs, analytic combinatorics, generating functions, asymptotic expansion

1 Introduction

This article investigates the number $\mathrm{CSG}_{n,k}$ of connected graphs with n vertices and $n+k$ edges. Following the definition of Janson et al. (1993), the quantity k, equal to the difference between the numbers of edges and vertices, is called the *excess* of the graph.

Related works The enumeration of connected graphs according to their number of vertices and edges has a long history. We have chosen to present it not chronologically, but from the sparsest to the densest graphs, *i.e.* according to the speed growth of the excess with respect to the number of vertices.

Trees are the simplest connected graphs, and reach the minimal excess -1. They were enumerated in 1860 by Borchardt, and his result, known as *Cayley's formula*, is $\mathrm{CSG}_{n,-1} = n^{n-2}$. Rényi (1959) then derived the formula for $\mathrm{CSG}_{n,0}$, which corresponds to connected graphs that contain exactly one cycle, and are called *unicycles*. Proofs of those two last results, based on analytic combinatorics, are available in Flajolet and Sedgewick (2009) and in Section 3. Wright (1980) applied generating function techniques and a combinatorial argument based on 3-*cores*, or *kernels*, to derive the asymptotics of connected graphs when k is a constant, or is slowly going to infinity ($\mathrm{k} = o(n^{1/3})$). Part of this work is reproduced in Section 4. Flajolet et al. (2004) derived a complete asymptotic expansion for connected graphs with fixed excess, following a purely analytic approach, discussed at the end of Section 2.2.

Łuczak (1990) obtained the asymptotics of $\mathrm{CSG}_{n,k}$ when k goes to infinity while $k = o(n)$. Bender et al. (1990) derived the asymptotics for a larger range, requiring only that $2k/n - \log(n)$ is bounded. This covers the interesting case where k is proportional to n. Their proof was based on the differential equations obtained by Wright, involving the generating functions of connected graphs indexed by their excesses (discussion at the end of Section 4). Since then, two simpler proofs were proposed. The proof of van der Hofstad and Spencer (2006) used probabilistic methods, analyzing a breadth-first search on a random graph. The proof of Pittel and Wormald (2005) relied on the enumeration of graphs with minimum degree at least 2. The present work follows the same global approach. The main difference is that, contrary to Pittel and Wormald who worked at the level of the sequences enumerating graph families, we use the powerful setting of generating functions to represent those families. This enables us to shorten the proofs, and to derive more error terms in the asymptotics.

*Part of this work has been published by de Panafieu (2016).

†Email: depanafieuelie[at]gmail.com. This work was partially founded by Sorbonne Universités, UPMC Univ Paris 06, CNRS, LIP6 UMR 7606, France; the Austrian Science Fund (FWF) grant F5004; the Amadeus program and the PEPS HYDrATA.

Erdős and Rényi (1960) proved that almost all graphs are connected when $2k/n - \log(n)$ tends to infinity. As a corollary, the asymptotics of connected graphs with those parameters is equivalent to the total number of graphs $\binom{n(n-1)/2}{n+k}$.

Motivations and contributions Our main result is the derivation of a complete asymptotic expansion for the number of connected graphs with a number of edges growing linearly with the number of vertices.

Theorem 1. *When k/n has a positive limit and d is fixed, then the following asymptotics holds*

$$\mathrm{CSG}_{n,k} = D_{n,k}\left(1 + c_1 n^{-1} + \cdots + c_{d-1} n^{-(d-1)} + \mathcal{O}(n^{-d})\right),$$

where the dominant term $D_{n,k}$ is derived in Lemma 12, and the (c_j) are computable constants.

After three proofs of the asymptotics of connected graphs when the excess grows linearly with the number of vertices, what is the point of deriving yet another one? A first reason is that each proof introduces new techniques, which can then be applied to investigate other graph families. In our case, those techniques are the following.

- It was already observed by Flajolet et al. (1989) and Janson et al. (1993) that multigraphs (loops and double edges allowed) are better suited for generating function manipulations than simple graphs. In Section 2.3, we improve their model to make it more compatible with the formalism of the symbolic method (Flajolet and Sedgewick (2009)) and of species theory (Bergeron et al. (1997)).
- The generating functions of graphs with degree constraints were recently computed by de Panafieu and Ramos (2016), and we apply and improve this result to enumerate graphs and multigraphs with minimum degree at least 2.
- We apply an inclusion-exclusion technique to remove loops and double edges from multigraphs, turning them into graphs. Collet et al. (2016) are currently extending this new approach to enumerate graphs with forbidden patterns, and to count the occurrences of subgraphs from a given family in random graphs.
- New exact expression for the generating functions of interesting families of (multi)graphs are derived, including connected graphs (Theorems 7 and 4), and graphs without trees and unicycles (Theorems 11 and 6).

Connected graphs appear naturally in various application, which motivates their study. They are also the atoms of graphs, so their analysis informs about the typical structure of random graphs. This was illustrated by the work of Erdős and Rényi (1960), which introduced the analysis of random graphs and the probabilistic approach. They proved that when the ratio of the number m of edges over the number n of vertices is less than $1/2$ (*sub-critical graphs*), the size of the largest component of a typical graph is $\mathcal{O}(\log(n))$, while it becomes $\Theta(n)$ for *super-critical graphs*, for which m/n is greater than $1/2$. More precise results were derived by Janson et al. (1993) in the sub-critical and critical ranges (when m/n is close to $1/2$), applying analytic combinatorics and the results of Wright (1980). Super-critical random graphs were not investigated in this paper, as they typically contain a giant component. Indeed, the excess of this component grows linearly with its number of vertices, and the generating function of such connected graphs was not available in a tractable form for asymptotics analysis (this point is also discussed at the end of Section 2.2). One of the contributions of the present paper is the derivation of such a generating function (Theorem 7). We now plan to extend our work and derive precise results on the structure of super-critical random graphs.

A third motivation for the derivation of a new proof for the asymptotics of connected graphs is that each proof might be extended to various generalizations of the classic model of graphs. We are working on the structure of random graphs with degree constraints (to follow de Panafieu and Ramos (2016), non-uniform hypergraphs (de Panafieu (2015b)), and inhomogeneous graphs (de Panafieu (2015a); de Panafieu and Ravelomanana (2015)).

Finally, our result is more precise than the previous ones: we derive an asymptotic expansion, *i.e.* a potentially infinite number of error terms. This is characteristic of the analytic combinatorics approach, where the generating functions capture all the combinatorial information, and lost only occurs at the asymptotic extraction.

The proofs of this paper are based on analytic combinatorics, which classically follows two steps. First, the combinatorial structures of the families of graphs we are interested in are translated into generating function relations. This is achieved applying tools developed by species theory (Bergeron et al. (1997)) and the symbolic method (Flajolet and Sedgewick (2009)). Then the asymptotic expansions of the cardinality of those families are extracted. Specifically, we will apply the saddle-point method, a classic technique from the field (see *e.g.* (Flajolet and Sedgewick, 2009, Section VIII.8), Bender and Richmond (1999), and Pemantle and Wilson (2013)). We chose to work more on the combinatorial part, deriving the generating functions in a "nice" form, so that the asymptotic extractions are achieved using "black box theorems", and the technicalities of the second step are (mainly) avoided.

Outline of the article The notations, graph model, and multigraph model are introduced in Section 2. Classic results on connected graphs with excess -1 (trees) and 0 (unicycles) are derived in Section 3. Section 4 recall the results of Wright (1980) on connected graphs and multigraphs with fixed excess. A new proof of those results is also derived in Sections 5.2 and 6.3. We then focus on connected multigraphs with an excess growing linearly with their number of vertices, deriving exact and asymptotics results in Section 5. Those results are interesting in themselves, and introduce the techniques then applied, in Section 6, to enumerate connected graphs with large excess.

2 Notations and models

We introduce the notations adopted in this article, the standard graph model, and a multigraph model better suited for generating function manipulations.

2.1 Notations

A *multiset* is an unordered collection of objects, where repetitions are allowed. *Sets*, or *families*, are then multisets without repetitions. A *sequence*, or *tuple*, is an ordered multiset. We use the parenthesis notation $(u_1, \dots, u_n)$ for sequences, and the brace notation $\{u_1, \dots, u_n\}$ for sets and multisets. The cardinality of a set or multiset S is denoted by $|S|$. The double factorial notation for odd numbers stands for

$$(2k-1)!! = \frac{(2k)!}{2^k k!},$$

and $[z^n]F(z)$ denotes the nth coefficient of the series expansion of $F(z)$ at $z = 0$, so that

$$[z^n] \sum_{m \geq 0} f_m z^m = f_n.$$

The derivative of the function f with respect to the variable x is denoted by $\partial_x f(x)$, or by $f'(x)$ when there is no ambiguity about the variable.

2.2 Graphs

We consider in this article the classic model of graphs, *a.k.a. simple graphs*, with labelled vertices and unlabelled unoriented edges. All edges are distinct and no edge links a vertex to itself. We naturally adopt for graphs generating functions exponential with respect to the number of vertices, and ordinary with respect to the number of edges (see Flajolet and Sedgewick (2009), or Bergeron et al. (1997)).

Definition 1. *A graph G is a pair $(V(G), E(G))$, where $V(G)$ is the labelled set of vertices, and $E(G)$ is the set of edges. Each edge is a set of two vertices from $V(G)$. The number of vertices (resp. of edges) is $n(G) = |V(G)|$ (resp. $m(G) = |E(G)|$). The* excess *$k(G)$ is defined as $m(G) - n(G)$. The generating function of a family $\mathcal{F}$ of graphs is*

$$F(z, w) = \sum_{G \in \mathcal{F}} w^{m(G)} \frac{z^{n(G)}}{n(G)!},$$

and $F_k(z)$ denotes the generating function of multigraphs from $\mathcal{F}$ with excess k,

$$F_k(z) = [y^k] F(z/y, y).$$

As always in analytic combinatorics and species theory, the labels are distinct elements that belong to a totally ordered set. When counting labelled objects (here, graphs), we always assume that the labels are consecutive integers starting at 1. Another formulation is that we consider two objects as equivalent if there exists an increasing relabelling sending one to the other.

With those conventions, the generating function of all graphs is

$$\mathrm{SG}(z, w) = \sum_{n \geq 0} (1 + w)^{\binom{n}{2}} \frac{z^n}{n!},$$

because a graph with n vertices has $\binom{n}{2}$ possible edges. Since a graph is a set of connected graphs, the generating function of connected graphs $\mathrm{CSG}(z, w)$ satisfies the relation

$$\mathrm{SG}(z, w) = e^{\mathrm{CSG}(z,w)}.$$

We obtain the classic closed form for the generating function of connected graphs

$$\mathrm{CSG}(z, w) = \log\left(\sum_{n \geq 0} (1 + w)^{\binom{n}{2}} \frac{z^n}{n!} \right).$$

This expression was the starting point of the analysis of Flajolet et al. (2004), who worked on graphs with fixed excess. However, as already observed by those authors, it is complex to analyze, because of "*magical*" cancellations in the coefficients. The reason of those cancellations is the presence of trees, which are the only connected components with negative excess. In this paper, we follow a different approach, closer to the one of Pittel and Wormald (2005): we consider *cores*, *i.e.* graphs with minimum degree at least 2, and add rooted trees to their vertices. This setting produces all graphs without trees.

2.3 Multigraphs

As already observed by Flajolet et al. (1989); Janson et al. (1993), *multigraphs* are better suited for generating function manipulations than graphs. We propose a new definition for those objects, distinct but related with the one used by Flajolet et al. (1989); Janson et al. (1993), and link the generating functions of graphs and multigraphs in Lemma 1. We define a multigraph as a graph-like objects with labelled vertices, and labelled oriented edges, where loops and multiple edges are allowed. Since vertices and edges are labelled, we choose exponential generating functions with respect to both quantities. Furthermore, a weight $1/2$ is assigned to each edge, for a reason that will become clear in Lemma 1.

Definition 2. *A multigraph G is a pair $(V(G), E(G))$, where $V(G)$ is the set of labelled vertices, and $E(G)$ is the set of labelled edges (the edge labels are independent from the vertex labels). Each edge is a triplet (v, w, e), where v, w are vertices, and e is the label of the edge. The number of vertices (resp. number of edges, excess) is $n(G) = |V(G)|$ (resp. $m(G) = |E(G)|$, $k(G) = m(G) - n(G)$). The generating function of the family $\mathcal{F}$ of multigraphs is*

$$F(z, w) = \sum_{G \in \mathcal{F}} \frac{w^{m(G)}}{2^{m(G)} m(G)!} \frac{z^{n(G)}}{n(G)!},$$

and $F_k(z)$ denotes the generating function $[y^k] F(z/y, y)$.

The number of multigraphs with n vertices and excess k in the family $\mathcal{F}$ is then

$$n!2^m m![z^n w^m]F(z,w) = n!2^{n+k}(n+k)![z^n]F_k(z).$$

As a consequence of the definition, the generating function of all multigraphs is

$$\sum_{n\geq 0} e^{wn^2/2}\frac{z^n}{n!}.$$

Figure 5 presents an example of multigraph. A major difference between graphs and multigraphs is the possibility of loops and multiple edges.

Definition 3. *A* loop *(resp.* double edge*) of a multigraph G is a subgraph (V,E) (i.e. $V \subset V(G)$ and $E \subset E(G)$) isomorphic to the following left multigraph (resp. to one of the following right multigraphs).*



The set of loops and double edges of a multigraph G is denoted by $\mathrm{LD}(G)$*, and its cardinality by* $\mathrm{ld}(G)$*.*

In particular, a multigraph that has no double edge contains no multiple edge. Multigraphs are better suited for generating function manipulations than graphs. However, we aim at deriving results on the graph model, since it has been adopted both by the graph theory and the combinatorics communities. The following lemma, illustrated in Figure 1, links the generating functions of both models.

Lemma 1. *Let* $\mathrm{MG}^{\setminus \mathrm{LD}}$ *denote the family of multigraphs that contain neither loops nor double edges, and p the projection from* $\mathrm{MG}^{\setminus \mathrm{LD}}$ *to the set* SG *of graphs, that erases the edge labels and orientations, as illustrated in Figure 1. Let $\mathcal{F}$ denote a subfamily of* $\mathrm{MG}^{\setminus \mathrm{LD}}$*, stable by edge relabelling and change of orientations. Then there exists a family $\mathcal{H}$ of graphs such that $p^{-1}(\mathcal{H}) = \mathcal{F}$. Furthermore, the generating functions of $\mathcal{F}$ and $\mathcal{H}$, with the respective conventions of multigraphs and graphs, are equal*

$$\sum_{G\in\mathcal{F}} \frac{w^{m(G)}}{2^{m(G)}m(G)!}\frac{z^{n(G)}}{n(G)!} = \sum_{G\in\mathcal{H}} w^{m(G)}\frac{z^{n(G)}}{n(G)!}.$$



Figure 1: A graph G and the set $\mathcal{F}$ of multigraphs sent by p (defined in Lemma 1) to the graph G. The generating function of $\{G\}$ (resp. $\mathcal{F}$) is $w^2\frac{z^3}{3!}$ (resp. $8\frac{w^2}{2^2 2!}\frac{z^3}{3!}$). As stated by Lemma 1, those generating functions are equal.

3 Trees and unicycles

In this section, we recall the classic results on the generating functions of the simplest connected graphs: trees. They are available in Flajolet and Sedgewick (2009); Janson et al. (1993). Since the number of edges of a tree is one less than its number of vertices, trees reach the minimum possible excess -1. As illustrated in Figure 2, a multi-tree is simply a tree where edges are labelled and oriented, so the generating functions of trees and multi-trees are identical. A tree is *rooted* when one vertex, called the *root*, is distinguished.



Figure 2: A tree, a multi-tree, a unicycle, and a multi-unicycle.

Lemma 2. *The generating functions of rooted trees $T(z)$ and trees $U(z)$ are characterized by the relations*

$$T(z) = ze^{T(z)}, \qquad U(z) = T(z) - \frac{1}{2}T(z)^2.$$

Proof. A rooted tree is a vertex (the root) with a set of children, which are themselves rooted trees, so

$$T(z) = ze^{T(z)}.$$

A tree where one vertex is marked becomes a rooted tree, so $zU'(z) = T(z)$. Solving this differential equation, we obtain

$$U(z) = T(z) - \frac{1}{2}T(z)^2.$$

This expression can also be derived from the *dissymmetry theorem* of Bergeron et al. (1997). □

Applying the Lagrange inversion (see Flajolet and Sedgewick (2009)) to this lemma, we obtain that the number of trees with n vertices is n^{n-2}; a result first proven by Borchardt in 1860 and known as *Cayley's Formula*. The number of multi-trees with n vertices is then $2^{n-1}(n-1)!n^{n-2}$.

A *unicycle* (resp. *multi-unicycle*) is a connected graph (resp. multigraph) of excess 0. Equivalently, this is a graph (multigraph) that contains exactly one cycle (see Figure 2). Multi-unicycles differ from unicycles because their edges are labelled and oriented, but also because their cycle might have length 1 (a loop) or 2 (a double edge).

Lemma 3. *The generating functions of multi-unicycles $MV(z)$ and unicycles $V(z)$ are characterized by the relations*

$$MV(z) = \frac{1}{2}\log\Big(\frac{1}{1-T(z)}\Big), \qquad V(z) = MV(z) - \frac{1}{2}T(z) - \frac{1}{4}T(z)^2.$$

Proof. A multi-unicycle is a cycle where vertices are replaced by rooted trees, so

$$MV(z) = \frac{1}{2}\log\Big(\frac{1}{1-T(z)}\Big).$$

The generating function of multi-unicycles where the cycle is a loop or a double edges is

$$\frac{1}{2}T(z) + \frac{1}{4}T(z)^2.$$

Therefore, the generating function of multi-unicycles that contain neither loop nor double edges is

$$MV(z) - \frac{1}{2}T(z) - \frac{1}{4}T(z)^2.$$

According to Lemma 1, this is equal to the generating function of unicycles. □

4 Connected graphs and multigraphs with fixed positive excess

This section borrows its results from Wright (1980) and (Janson et al., 1993, Lemma 1 p.33). They are presented for completeness, and will prove useful in the rest of the paper as well.

As illustrated in Figure 3, the *kernel* of a multigraph G is defined as the multigraph obtained after removing recursively all vertices of degree 0 and 1, replacing any two edges attached to the same vertex of degree 2 with one edge, and removing vertices of degree 2 contained twice in the same edge (*i.e.* isolated loops). As a consequence, a kernel has minimum degree at least 3, and all its components have positive excess. Reversely, any multigraph where all components have positive excess can be built uniquely from its kernel:

- a rooted tree is planted at each vertex of the kernel,
- each edge of the kernel is replaced by a path where rooted trees hang at the vertices.

Lemma 4. *The number of kernels of excess k, i.e. multigraphs with minimum degree at least 3, is finite.*

Proof. Let us consider a multigraph G with minimum degree at least 3, n vertices, m edges, and excess $k = m - n$. Since the sum of the degrees is equal to twice the number of edges, we have

$$3n \leq \sum_{v \in V(G)} \deg(v) = 2m,$$

which implies

$$n \leq 2m - 2n = 2k \quad \text{and} \quad m = k + n \leq 3k.$$

The number of multigraphs with at most $2k$ vertices and $3k$ edges is finite, which concludes the proof. □

Let $\mathrm{SG}^{>0}(z, w)$ (resp. $\mathrm{MG}^{>0}(z, w)$) denote the generating function of graphs (resp. multigraphs) where all components have positive excess, *i.e.* which contain neither trees nor unicycles (resp. multi-trees nor multi-unicycles). The subset of those graphs (resp. multigraphs) of excess k is denoted by

$$\mathrm{SG}_k^{>0}(z) = [y^k]\,\mathrm{SG}^{>0}(z/y, y), \qquad \mathrm{MG}_k^{>0}(z) = [y^k]\,\mathrm{MG}^{>0}(z/y, y).$$

The following Lemma was a key ingredient of the proofs of Bender et al. (1990); Flajolet et al. (2004) for the enumeration of connected graphs.

Lemma 5 (Wright (1980))**.** *For each $k > 0$, there exist computable polynomials K_k, MK_k such that*

$$\mathrm{SG}_k^{>0}(z) = \frac{K_k(T(z))}{(1 - T(z))^{3k}}, \qquad \mathrm{MG}_k^{>0}(z) = \frac{MK_k(T(z))}{(1 - T(z))^{3k}}.$$

Furthermore, there exist computable polynomials $K^\star$, $MK^\star$ such that the generating functions of connected graphs and multigraphs of excess k are

$$\mathrm{CSG}_k(z) = \frac{K_k^\star(T(z))}{(1 - T(z))^{3k}}, \qquad \mathrm{CMG}_k(z) = \frac{MK_k^\star(T(z))}{(1 - T(z))^{3k}}.$$

Proof. We mentioned that any multigraph where all components have positive excess can be built from its kernel:

- a rooted tree is planted at each vertex of the kernel,
- each edge of the kernel is replaced by a path where rooted trees hang at the vertices.

The generating functions of rooted trees and of those "paths of trees" are

$$\frac{T(wz)}{w}, \qquad \frac{w}{1-T(wz)}.$$

Observe that the two vertices at the end of the paths are not counted, since they are already represented as the roots of the rooted trees. Therefore, the generating function of multigraphs where all components have positive excess is

$$\mathrm{MG}^{>0}(z,w) = \sum_{\text{kernel } G} \frac{\left(w\big(1-T(wz)\big)^{-1}\right)^{m(G)}}{2^{m(G)}m(G)!} \frac{(T(wz)/w)^{n(G)}}{n(G)!}.$$

A multigraph and its kernel share the same excess. The generating function of multigraphs of excess k where all components have positive excess is then

$$\mathrm{MG}_k^{>0}(z) = [y^k]\,\mathrm{MG}^{>0}(z/y,y) = \sum_{\text{kernel } G \text{ of excess } k} \frac{(1/(1-T(z)))^{n(G)+k}}{2^{n(G)+k}(n(G)+k)!} \frac{T(z)^{n(G)}}{n(G)!}.$$

The set of kernels is equal to the set of multigraphs with minimum degree at least 3. When the excess k is fixed, this set is finite, according to Lemma 4. Furthermore, the maximal number of vertices (resp. edges) of a kernel of excess k is $2k$ (resp. $3k$). Therefore, there exists a polynomial $MK_k(x)$ such that

$$\mathrm{MG}_k^{>0}(z) = \frac{MK_k(T(z))}{(1-T(z))^{3k}}.$$

The loops and double edges of a multigraph where all components have positive excess all appear in its kernel. Therefore, the generating function of multigraphs that contain at least one loop or one double edge can be expressed as

$$\frac{MK^{(\mathrm{ld})}(T(z))}{(1-T(z))^{3k}}$$

for some polynomial $MK^{(\mathrm{ld})}$. Thus the generating function of multigraphs of excess k that contain neither loops nor double edges is

$$\frac{MK(T(z)) - MK^{(\mathrm{ld})}(T(z))}{(1-T(z))^{3k}}.$$

According to Lemma 1, this expression is equal to

$$\mathrm{SG}_k^{>0}(z) = \frac{MK(T(z)) - MK^{(\mathrm{ld})}(T(z))}{(1-T(z))^{3k}}.$$

A multigraph is connected if and only if its kernel is connected. Therefore, if we restrain the previous analysis to connected kernels, we obtain the expression of the generating function of connected multigraphs and graphs of excess k.

$$\mathrm{CMG}_k(z) = \frac{MK_k^\star(T(z))}{(1-T(z))^{3k}}, \qquad \mathrm{CSG}_k(z) = \frac{K_k^\star(T(z))}{(1-T(z))^{3k}}.$$

□

Applying a singularity analysis (see (Flajolet and Sedgewick, 2009, Section VI.4)), a complete asymptotic expansion of connected graphs and multigraphs with fixed excess can be derived.



Figure 3: For the sake of clarity, the labels and orientations have been omitted. Left, a multigraph with four components. Right, its kernel, obtained by removing recursively all vertices of degree 0 and 1, and merging the pairs of edges with a degree 2 vertex in common. The two lowest components of the multigraph, a multi-unicycle and a tree, have disappeared in the kernel.

Theorem 2 (Wright (1980); Flajolet et al. (2004))**.** *When k is fixed while n tends to infinity, the number of connected graphs (resp. multigraphs) with n vertices and excess k is*

$$\mathrm{CSG}_{n,k} = \frac{K_k^\star(1)\sqrt{\pi}}{\Gamma(3k/2)} \left(\frac{n}{e}\right)^n \left(\frac{n}{2}\right)^{(3k-1)/2} \left(1+\mathcal{O}(n^{-1/2})\right),$$
$$\mathrm{CMG}_{n,k} = \frac{MK_k^\star(1)\sqrt{\pi}}{\Gamma(3k/2)} \left(\frac{n}{e}\right)^n \left(\frac{n}{2}\right)^{(3k-1)/2} \left(1+\mathcal{O}(n^{-1/2})\right),$$

and an arbitrary number of correcting terms in powers of $n^{-1/2}$ can be computed as well.

However, observe that this result is only useful for fixed k, since it tells nothing about the evolution of K_k or MK_k as k increases. Wright (1980) derived a differential equation characterizing the polynomials $(K_k(x))$, which was the starting point of the proof of Bender et al. (1990) for the asymptotics of connected graphs. Our proof does not rely on this result.

A new proof of Theorem 2 is derived in Sections 5.2 and 6.3.

5 Connected multigraphs with large excess

In this section, we derive the asymptotic expansion of the number $\mathrm{CMG}_{n,k}$ of connected multigraphs with n vertices and excess k, when k and n are proportional (Theorem 5). The main asymptotics had already been derived by de Panafieu (2014). We believe the result to be valuable in itself, and it is a good introduction to the ideas developed in Section 6, where connected simple graphs are counted.

5.1 Exact enumeration

Following the same approach as Pittel and Wormald (2005) and using tools developed by de Panafieu and Ramos (2016), we first consider multigraphs with minimum degree at least 2.

Theorem 3 (de Panafieu and Ramos (2016))**.** *The generating function of* multicores*, i.e. multigraphs with minimum degree at least 2, is*

$$\mathrm{MCore}(z,w) = \sum_{m\geq 0} (2m)! [x^{2m}] e^{z(e^x-1-x)} \frac{w^m}{2^m m!}.$$

Proof. Let us consider a multigraph G with n vertices and m edges. As illustrated in Figure 4, each edge $(v,w,\ell) \in E(G)$ can be replaced by two half-edges, one attached to the vertex v and labelled $2\ell-1$, the other attached to w and labelled 2ℓ. The set of half-edges containing a given vertex has its size equal

to the degree of this vertex. If G has minimum degree at least 2, then the size of those sets is at least 2. Therefore, the multigraph G is represented as a set of labelled sets containing together $2m$ labels, and the number of sets is equal to the number of vertices of G, so

$$\mathrm{MCore}(z,w) = \sum_{m\geq 0} (2m)![x^{2m}] e^{z(e^x-1-x)} \frac{w^m}{2^m m!}.$$

□

Figure 4: Left, a multigraph. Right, the multigraph obtained after cutting each edge into two labelled half-edges, as explained in the proof of Theorem 3.

We apply the previous results to investigate multigraphs where all components have positive excess, *i.e.* that contain neither trees nor multi-unicycles.

Lemma 6. *The generating function of multigraphs with excess k where each component has positive excess is*

$$\mathrm{MG}_k^{>0}(z) = (2k-1)!![x^{2k}] \frac{e^{-MV(z)}}{\left(1 - T(z)\frac{e^x-1-x}{x^2/2}\right)^{k+1/2}}.$$

Proof. In the expression of the generating function of multicores from Theorem 3, after developing the exponential as a sum over n and applying the change of variable $m \leftarrow k+n$, we obtain

$$\mathrm{MCore}(z,w) = \sum_{k\geq 0} [x^{2k}] \sum_{n\geq 0} \frac{(2(k+n))!}{2^{k+n}(k+n)!} \frac{\left(zw\frac{e^x-1-x}{x^2}\right)^n}{n!} w^k.$$

The sum over n is replaced by its closed form

$$\mathrm{MCore}(z,w) = \sum_{k\geq 0} [x^{2k}] \frac{(2k-1)!!}{\left(1 - zw\frac{e^x-1-x}{x^2/2}\right)^{k+1/2}} w^k.$$

The generating function of multicores of excess k is then

$$\mathrm{MCore}_k(z) = [y^k]\,\mathrm{MCore}(z/y, y) = (2k-1)!![x^{2k}] \frac{1}{\left(1 - z\frac{e^x-1-x}{x^2/2}\right)^{k+1/2}}.$$

This part of the proof was purely analytical, involving non-intuitive generating function manipulations and a remarkable identity. We would rather have a combinatorial proof of this relation, and would be interested by the opinion of the reader.

Any multigraph where no component is a tree can be uniquely decomposed as a multicore where vertices are replaced by rooted trees. A multigraph where no component is a tree is a multigraph where each component has positive excess, and a set of multi-unicycles, so

$$\mathrm{MG}_k^{>0}(z) e^{MV(z)} = \mathrm{MCore}_k(T(z)),$$

which implies

$$\mathrm{MG}_k^{>0}(z) = (2k-1)!![x^{2k}] \frac{e^{-MV(z)}}{\left(1 - T(z)\frac{e^x-1-x}{x^2/2}\right)^{k+1/2}}.$$

□

We finally prove an exact expression for the number of connected multigraphs, which asymptotics is derived in Section 5.3.

Theorem 4. *For $k > 0$, the number of connected multigraphs with n vertices and excess k is*

$$\mathrm{CMG}_{n,k} = 2^{n+k}(n+k)! \sum_{q=1}^{k} \frac{(-1)^{q+1}}{q} \sum_{\substack{k_1+\cdots+k_q=k \\ \forall j,\ 1\le k_j\le k-q+1}} n![z^n] \prod_{j=1}^{q} \mathrm{MG}_{k_j}^{>0}(z).$$

Proof. Each multigraph in $\mathrm{MG}^{>0}$ is a set of connected graphs with positive excess, so

$$\sum_{\ell\ge 0} \mathrm{MG}_{\ell}^{>0}(z) y^{\ell} = e^{\sum_{k>0} \mathrm{CMG}_k(z) y^k}.$$

Observe that $\mathrm{MG}_0^{>0}(z) = 1$. Indeed, the only multigraph of excess 0 where all components have positive excess is the empty multigraph (this can also be deduced by calculus from Lemma 6). Taking the logarithm of the previous expression and extracting the coefficient $[y^k]$, we obtain

$$\mathrm{CMG}_k(z) = [y^k] \log\left(1 + \sum_{\ell\ge 1} \mathrm{MG}_{\ell}^{>0}(z) y^{\ell}\right) = \sum_{q\ge 1} \frac{(-1)^{q+1}}{q} \sum_{\substack{k_1+\cdots+k_q=k \\ \forall j,\ 1\le k_j\le k-q+1}} \prod_{j=1}^{q} \mathrm{MG}_{k_j}^{>0}(z).$$

According to the remark that follows Definition 2, we have

$$\mathrm{CMG}_{n,k} = n! 2^{n+k} (n+k)! [z^n] \,\mathrm{CMG}_k(z),$$

which leads to the result. □

5.2 Asymptotic expansion of connected multigraphs with fixed excess

Combining Lemma 6 and Theorem 4, we obtain the following expression for the number of connected multigraphs with n vertices and excess $k > 0$

$$\mathrm{CMG}_{n,k} = 2^{n+k}(n+k)! \sum_{q=1}^{k} \frac{(-1)^{q+1}}{q} \sum_{\substack{k_1+\cdots+k_q=k \\ \forall j,\ 1\le k_j\le k-q+1}} n![z^n] \prod_{j=1}^{q} (2k_j-1)!! [x^{2k_j}] \frac{e^{-MV(z)}}{\left(1 - T(z)\frac{e^x-1-x}{x^2/2}\right)^{k_j+1/2}}.$$

For any positive fixed k, the domains of the two sums are finite. The coefficient extraction

$$[x^{2k_j}] \frac{e^{-MV(z)}}{\left(1 - T(z)\frac{e^x-1-x}{x^2/2}\right)^{k_j+1/2}}$$

can be expressed as the evaluation at 0 of the $(2k_j)$th derivative with respect to x of the function

$$\frac{e^{-MV(z)}}{\left(1 - T(z)\frac{e^x-1-x}{x^2/2}\right)^{k_j+1/2}}.$$

Since $e^{-MV(z)} = \sqrt{1-T(z)}$ (Lemma 3), by recurrence on k_j, this is equal to

$$\frac{MK_k^{\star}(T(z))}{(1-T(z))^{3k_j}},$$

for some computable polynomial $MK_k^{\star}$. Applying a singularity analysis (Flajolet and Sedgewick, 2009, Section VI.4), this provides a new proof of the asymptotic expansion of connected multigraphs with fixed excess, already mentioned in Theorem 2.

5.3 Asymptotic expansion of connected multigraphs with large excess

In this section, we derive the asymptotic expansion of $\mathrm{CMG}_{n,k}$, the number of connected multigraphs with n vertices and excess k, up to a multiplicative factor $(1+\mathcal{O}(n^{-d}))$, where d is an arbitrary fixed integer.

We will prove in Lemma 9 that in the expression of $\mathrm{CMG}_{n,k}$ from Theorem 4, the terms corresponding to $q \geq d+5$ or $\max_j(k_j) \leq k-d-4$ are negligible, so

$$\mathrm{CMG}_{n,k} = 2^{n+k}(n+k)! \sum_{q=1}^{d+4} \frac{(-1)^{q+1}}{q} \sum_{\substack{k_1+\cdots+k_q=k \\ \forall j,\ 1\leq k_j \leq k-q+1 \\ \max_j(k_j)\geq k-d-3}} n![z^n] \prod_{j=1}^{q} \mathrm{MG}_{k_j}^{>0}(z) + \mathcal{O}(n^{-d}\,\mathrm{CMG}_{n,k}).$$

When k is large enough compared to d, we have $k-d-3 > k/2$, so there is a unique maximal k_j. Up to a symmetry of order q, we can assume it is reached by k_q, and introduce the notation $r = k - k_q$

$$\mathrm{CMG}_{n,k} = 2^{n+k}(n+k)! \sum_{q=1}^{d+4} (-1)^{q+1} \sum_{r=q-1}^{d+3} n![z^n]\,\mathrm{MG}_{k-r}^{>0}(z) \sum_{\substack{k_1+\cdots+k_{q-1}=r \\ \forall j,\ 1\leq k_j \leq r-q+1}} \prod_{j=1}^{q-1} \mathrm{MG}_{k_j}^{>0}(z) + \mathcal{O}(n^{-d}\,\mathrm{CMG}_{n,k}).$$

To simplify this expression, we apply Lemma 5 and introduce the polynomials

$$MK_{q,r}(x) = \sum_{\substack{k_1+\cdots+k_{q-1}=r \\ \forall j,\ 1\leq k_j \leq r-q+1}} \prod_{j=1}^{q-1} MK_{k_j}(x),$$

so we obtain

$$\mathrm{CMG}_{n,k} = 2^{n+k}(n+k)! \sum_{q=1}^{d+4} (-1)^{q+1} \sum_{r=q-1}^{d+3} n![z^n]\,\mathrm{MG}_{k-r}^{>0}(z) \frac{MK_{q,r}(T(z))}{(1-T(z))^{3r}} + \mathcal{O}(n^{-d}\,\mathrm{CMG}_{n,k}). \tag{1}$$

We have then expressed $\mathrm{CMG}_{n,k}$, up to negligible terms, as a finite sum of terms. Their asymptotic expansion is derived in the following lemma.

Lemma 7. *When k/n tends toward a positive limit, while q, r and d are fixed, the term*

$$n![z^n]\,\mathrm{MG}_{k-r}^{>0}(z) \frac{MK_{q,r}(T(z))}{(1-T(z))^{3r}}$$

has the following asymptotic expansion

$$\frac{n!(2(k-r)-1)!!}{2\pi k\sqrt{\det(H(\zeta,\lambda))}\zeta^n\lambda^{2(k-r)}} \frac{e^{-MV(\zeta)}}{\left(1-T(\zeta)\frac{e^\lambda-1-\lambda}{\lambda^2/2}\right)^{k-r+\frac{1}{2}}} \frac{MK_{q,r}(T(\zeta))}{(1-T(\zeta))^{3r}} \left(1+c_1 n^{-1}+\cdots+c_{d-1}n^{-d+1}+\mathcal{O}(n^{-d})\right),$$

where the values λ, ζ and the 2×2 matrix $(H_{i,j}(z,x))_{1\leq i,j\leq 2}$ are characterized by the relations

$$\frac{\lambda}{2}\frac{e^\lambda+1}{e^\lambda-1} = \frac{k}{n}+1, \qquad T(\zeta) = \frac{\lambda}{e^\lambda-1}, \qquad H_{i,j}(e^{t_1},e^{t_2}) = -\partial_{t_i}\partial_{t_j}\log\left(1-T(e^{t_1})\frac{e^{e^{t_2}}-1-e^{t_2}}{e^{2t_2}/2}\right),$$

and the (c_j) are computable constants. In particular, when q and r are fixed, we have

$$n![z^n]\,\mathrm{MG}_{k-r}^{>0}(z) \frac{MK_{q,r}(T(z))}{(1-T(z))^{3r}} = \Theta\left(n^{-r-1}\frac{n!(2k-1)!!}{\left(1-T(\zeta)\frac{e^\lambda-1-\lambda}{\lambda^2/2}\right)^k\zeta^n\lambda^{2k}}\right).$$

Proof. According to Lemma 5, we have

$$n![z^n]\,\mathrm{MG}^{>0}_{k-r}(z)\frac{MK_{q,r}(T(z))}{(1-T(z))^{3r}} = n!(2(k-r)-1)!![z^n x^{2(k-r)}]\frac{e^{-MV(z)}}{\left(1-T(z)\frac{e^x-1-x}{x^2/2}\right)^{k-r+1/2}}\frac{MK_{q,r}(T(z))}{(1-T(z))^{3r}},$$

which we rewrite as

$$n!(2(k-r)-1)!![z^n x^{2k}]A(z,x)B(z,x)^k$$

where we have introduced the notations

$$B(z,x) = \left(1-T(z)\frac{e^x-1-x}{x^2/2}\right)^{-1},$$
$$A(z,x) = x^{2r}e^{-MV(z)}B(z,x)^{-r+1/2}\frac{MK_{q,r}(T(z))}{(1-T(z))^{3r}}.$$

We recognize the classic *large powers* setting, and a bivariate saddle-point method (see *e.g.* Bender and Richmond (1999)) is applied to extract the asymptotics

$$n!(2(k-r)-1)!![z^n x^{2k}]A(z,x)B(z,x)^k \sim n!(2(k-r)-1)!!\frac{A(\zeta,\lambda)}{2\pi k\sqrt{\det(H(\zeta,\lambda))}}\frac{B(\zeta,\lambda)^k}{\zeta^n\lambda^{2k}}$$

where ζ, λ and the 2×2 matrix $(H_{i,j}(z,x))_{1\le i,j\le 2}$ are characterized by the equations

$$\frac{\zeta\partial_\zeta B(\zeta,\lambda)}{B(\zeta,\lambda)} = \frac{n}{k},\quad \frac{\lambda\partial_\lambda B(\zeta,\lambda)}{B(\zeta,\lambda)} = 2,\quad H_{i,j}(e^{t_1},e^{t_2}) = \partial_{t_i}\partial_{t_j}\log\left(B(e^{t_1},e^{t_2})\right). \tag{2}$$

The system of equation characterizing ζ and λ is equivalent with

$$\frac{\lambda}{2}\frac{e^\lambda+1}{e^\lambda-1} = \frac{k}{n}+1,\qquad T(\zeta) = \frac{\lambda}{e^\lambda-1}.$$

As observed by Flajolet and Sedgewick (2009), an asymptotic expansion can be derived as well in the large powers setting. After replacing the coefficient extractions $[z^n x^{2k}]$ with Cauchy integrals on a torus of radii (ζ,λ),

$$n!(2(k-r)-1)!![z^n x^{2k}]A(z,x)B(z,x)^k = \frac{n!(2(k-r)-1)!!}{2\pi}\int_{-\pi}^{\pi}\int_{-\pi}^{\pi}A(\zeta e^{i\theta},\lambda e^{i\Psi})\frac{B(\zeta e^{i\theta},\lambda e^{i\Psi})^k}{(\zeta e^{i\theta})^n(\lambda e^{i\Psi})^{2k}}d\theta d\Psi,$$

we apply (Pemantle and Wilson, 2013, Theorem 5.1.2) to derive this expansion. The last result of the lemma is a consequence of the simple approximation, valid when r is fixed,

$$(2(k-r)-1)!! = \Theta(n^{-r}(2k-1)!!).$$

□

In particular, because of the factor $(2(k-r)-1)!!$ from the lemma we just proved, the dominant term in Equation (1) comes from $r=0$ (which implies $q=1$),

$$\mathrm{CMG}_{n,k} \sim \mathrm{MG}^{>0}_{n,k} \sim \frac{2^{n+k}(n+k)!n!(2k-1)!!}{2\pi k\sqrt{\det(H(\zeta,\lambda))}\zeta^n\lambda^{2k}}\frac{e^{-MV(\zeta)}}{\left(1-T(\zeta)\frac{e^\lambda-1-\lambda}{\lambda^2/2}\right)^{k+1/2}},$$

which is a

$$\Theta\left(n^{-1}\frac{n!(2k-1)!!}{\left(1-T(\zeta)\frac{e^\lambda-1-\lambda}{\lambda^2/2}\right)^k\zeta^n\lambda^{2k}}\right).$$

This implies a result already proven by Erdős and Rényi (1960): a typical random (multi)graph with a number of vertices proportional to the number of edges, where all components have positive excess, is typically connected. For the readers who prefer a more explicit expression for the asymptotics, we present the following lemma.

Lemma 8. *With the notations of Lemma 7, the dominant term in the asymptotics of*

$$\mathrm{MG}^{>0}_{n,k} \sim \frac{2^{n+k}(n+k)!n!(2k-1)!!}{2\pi k\sqrt{\det(H(\zeta,\lambda))}\zeta^n\lambda^{2k}}\frac{e^{-MV(\zeta)}}{\left(1-T(\zeta)\frac{e^\lambda-1-\lambda}{\lambda^2/2}\right)^{k+1/2}} \tag{3}$$

when k/n tends toward a positive limit is

$$\mathrm{MG}^{>0}_{n,k} \sim (n+k)^{n+k}n^{n+k}\frac{2^{n+k}e^{-n-k}\lambda^{-k}}{\left(\left(\frac{k}{n}+1\right)^2-\frac{\lambda^2}{4}\right)^{n/2}}\frac{\left(\frac{\lambda}{2}-\frac{k}{n}\right)\sqrt{\frac{n}{k}+1}}{\sqrt{\frac{\lambda^2}{4}\frac{n}{k}-\frac{k}{n}-1}}.$$

Proof. The factorials are replaced by their Stirling approximation

$$\frac{2^{n+k}(n+k)!n!(2k-1)!!}{2\pi k} \sim (n+k)^{n+k}n^{n+k}(k/n)^k2^{n+2k}e^{-2n-2k}\sqrt{\frac{2n}{k}\left(\frac{n}{k}+1\right)},$$

and the terms gathered according to their growth speed. The asymptotic of the first expression of the lemma is then

$$(n+k)^{n+k}n^{n+k}\frac{(k/n)^k2^{n+2k}e^{-2n-2k}}{\zeta^n\lambda^{2k}\left(1-T(\zeta)\frac{e^\lambda-1-\lambda}{\lambda^2/2}\right)^k}\sqrt{\frac{\frac{2n}{k}\left(\frac{n}{k}+1\right)}{\det(H(\zeta,\lambda))\left(1-T(\zeta)\frac{e^\lambda-1-\lambda}{\lambda^2/2}\right)}}e^{-MV(\zeta)}$$

To simplify this expression, we inject successively the following relations, derived from Lemmas 2, 3, and Equations (2)

$$\begin{aligned} H_{1,1} &= \tfrac{1}{(1-T(\zeta))^2}\tfrac{n}{k}+\tfrac{n^2}{k^2}, \\ H_{1,2} &= H_{2,1} = \tfrac{2}{1-T(\zeta)}+\tfrac{2n}{k}, \\ H_{2,2} &= \lambda(1-T(\zeta))\tfrac{n}{k}+2\lambda, \end{aligned} \qquad \begin{aligned} MV(z) &= \tfrac{1}{2}\log\left(\tfrac{1}{1-T(z)}\right), \\ T(\zeta) &= \tfrac{k}{n}+1-\tfrac{\lambda}{2}, \\ \zeta &= T(\zeta)e^{-T(\zeta)} = \left(\tfrac{k}{n}+1-\tfrac{\lambda}{2}\right)e^{-\frac{k}{n}-1+\frac{\lambda}{2}}, \\ e^\lambda &= 1+\tfrac{\lambda}{\frac{k}{n}+1-\frac{\lambda}{2}}. \end{aligned}$$

This is a simplification in the sense that all occurrences of ζ and $T(\zeta)$ disappear, and no λ is the argument of an exponential. In particular, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \zeta^n &= e^{-n-k}\left(\left(\tfrac{k}{n}+1\right)^2-\tfrac{\lambda^2}{4}\right)^{n/2}, \\ e^{-MV(z)} &= \sqrt{\tfrac{\lambda}{2}-\tfrac{k}{n}}, \end{aligned} \qquad \begin{aligned} 1-T(\zeta)\tfrac{e^\lambda-1-\lambda}{\lambda^2/2} &= \tfrac{2}{\lambda}\tfrac{k}{n}, \\ \det(H(\zeta,\lambda)) &= \tfrac{\lambda\left(\frac{\lambda}{2}\frac{n}{k}-1\right)\left(\frac{\lambda^2}{4}\frac{n^2}{k^2}-\frac{n}{k}-1\right)}{\left(\frac{\lambda}{2}-\frac{k}{n}\right)^2}. \end{aligned}$$

The asymptotic becomes

$$(n+k)^{n+k}n^{n+k}\frac{2^{n+k}e^{-n-k}\lambda^{-k}}{\left(\left(\frac{k}{n}+1\right)^2-\frac{\lambda^2}{4}\right)^{n/2}}\frac{\left(\frac{\lambda}{2}-\frac{k}{n}\right)\sqrt{\frac{n}{k}+1}}{\sqrt{\frac{\lambda^2}{4}\frac{n}{k}-\frac{k}{n}-1}}.$$

□

The asymptotic expansion of $\mathrm{CMG}_{n,k}$ is then obtained by application of Lemma 7 to replace the terms of Equation (1) by their asymptotic expansions. The only missing step is the proof that the terms corresponding to large values of q or small values of $\max_{1\le j\le q}(k_j)$ are indeed negligible.

Lemma 9. *For any fixed d (resp. fixed d and q), when k/n tends toward a positive limit, we have*

$$2^{n+k}(n+k)!\sum_{q=d+5}^{k}\frac{(-1)^{q-1}}{q}\sum_{\substack{k_1+\cdots+k_q=k\\ \forall j,\ 1\le k_j\le k-q+1}} n![z^n]\prod_{j=1}^{q}\mathrm{MG}^{>0}_{k_j}(z) = \mathcal{O}(n^{-d}\,\mathrm{MG}^{>0}_{n,k})$$

$$2^{n+k}(n+k)!\sum_{j\ge 0}\sum_{\substack{k_1+\cdots+k_q=k\\ \forall j,\ 1\le k_j\le k-d-4-j}} n![z^n]\prod_{j=1}^{q}\mathrm{MG}^{>0}_{k_j}(z) = \mathcal{O}(n^{-d}\,\mathrm{MG}^{>0}_{n,k}),$$

where $\mathrm{MG}^{>0}_{n,k} = n![z^n]\,\mathrm{MG}^{>0}_{k}(z)$ is the dominant term in the asymptotics of connected multigraphs.

Proof. Given q positive integers satisfying $k_1 + \cdots + k_q = k$, we first bound the term

$$n![z^n] \prod_{j=1}^{q} \mathrm{MG}_{k_j}^{>0}(z),$$

where we replace each $\mathrm{MG}_{k_j}^{>0}(z)$ with the expression derived in Lemma 6. We obtain

$$n![z^n] \prod_{j=1}^{q} (2k_j - 1)!![x^{2k_j}] \frac{e^{-MV(z)}}{\left(1 - T(z)\frac{e^x - 1 - x}{x^2/2}\right)^{k_j + 1/2}}.$$

To bound this term, we apply the simple inequality, valid for any bivariate generating function $f(z, x)$ with nonnegative coefficients:

$$[z^n x^{2k}] f(z, x) \leq \frac{f(\zeta, \lambda)}{\zeta^n \lambda^{2k}},$$

for any positive real values ζ, λ, where f is defined. We obtain

$$n![z^n] \prod_{j=1}^{q} \mathrm{MG}_{k_j}^{>0}(z) \leq n!(2k-1)!! \frac{e^{-qMV(\zeta)}}{\left(1 - T(\zeta)\frac{e^\lambda - 1 - \lambda}{\lambda^2/2}\right)^{k+1/2} \zeta^n \lambda^{2k}} \frac{\prod_{j=1}^{q}(2k_j - 1)!!}{(2k-1)!!}.$$

We choose for ζ, λ the values of the saddle-points from Lemma 7, so $e^{-MV(\zeta)} \leq 1$. Since

$$\mathrm{MG}_{n,k}^{>0} = \Theta\left(n^{-1} \frac{n!(2k-1)!!}{\left(1 - T(\zeta)\frac{e^\lambda - 1 - \lambda}{\lambda^2/2}\right)^{k} \zeta^n \lambda^{2k}} \right),$$

we obtain

$$n![z^n] \prod_{j=1}^{q} \mathrm{MG}_{k_j}^{>0}(z) = \frac{\prod_{j=1}^{q}(2k_j - 1)!!}{(2k-1)!!} \mathcal{O}\left(n\, \mathrm{MG}_{n,k}^{>0}\right).$$

To prove the lemma, it is then sufficient to prove that the sequence

$$S_{q,d,k} = \sum_{\substack{k_1 + \cdots + k_q = k \\ \forall j,\ 0 \leq k_j \leq k-d}} \frac{\prod_{j=1}^{q}(2k_j - 1)!!}{(2k-1)!!}$$

satisfies, for any fixed d (resp. when d and q are fixed),

$$\sum_{q=d+5}^{k} \frac{1}{q} S_{q,q-1,k} = \mathcal{O}(k^{-d-1}) \qquad \text{and} \qquad \sum_{j \geq 0} S_{q,d+4+j,k} = \mathcal{O}(k^{-d-1}).$$

The proof is available in Appendix 8.1. The two main ingredients are that the argument of the sum defining $S_{q,d,k}$ is maximal when one of the k_j is large (then the others remain small), and that $S_{q,0,k} \leq 3q$ for all $q \leq k$ (proof by recurrence). □

We cited the result of Lemma 9 at the beginning of the section, and proved it finally here. We did so to provide the reader a better intuition on the motivations of the steps of the proof. However, to ensure that there is no loop in the reasoning (*i.e.* that we did not prove Lemma 9 while assuming it), the next section, dealing with connected graphs, is presented the other way around. We finally derive the complete asymptotic expansion of connected multigraphs.

Theorem 5. *When k/n has a positive limit and d is fixed, the number $\mathrm{CMG}_{n,k}$ of connected multigraphs with n vertices and excess k is equal to*

$$(n+k)^{n+k}n^{n+k}\frac{2^{n+k}e^{-n-k}\lambda^{-k}}{\left(\left(\frac{k}{n}+1\right)^2-\frac{\lambda^2}{4}\right)^{n/2}}\frac{\left(\frac{\lambda}{2}-\frac{k}{n}\right)\sqrt{\frac{n}{k}+1}}{\sqrt{\frac{\lambda^2}{4}\frac{n}{k}-\frac{k}{n}-1}}\left(1+c_1n^{-1}+\cdots+c_{d-1}n^{-d+1}+\mathcal{O}(n^{-d})\right),$$

where the values λ is characterized by the relation

$$\frac{\lambda}{2}\frac{e^\lambda+1}{e^\lambda-1}=\frac{k}{n}+1,$$

and the (c_j) are computable constants (distinct from the one defined in Lemma 7).

Proof. As a consequence of Lemma 9, we have

$$\mathrm{CMG}_{n,k}=2^{n+k}(n+k)!\sum_{q=1}^{d+4}(-1)^{q+1}\sum_{r=q-1}^{d+3}n![z^n]\,\mathrm{MG}^{>0}_{k-r}(z)\frac{MK_{q,r}(T(z))}{(1-T(z))^r}+\mathcal{O}(n^{-d}\,\mathrm{MG}^{>0}_{n,k}),$$

so we only consider the sum of a finite number of terms, and q and r are bounded. Lemma 7 then gives the asymptotics of each of the summand

$$n![z^n]\,\mathrm{MG}^{>0}_{k-r}(z)\frac{MK_{q,r}(T(z))}{(1-T(z))^r}=\Theta\left(n^{-r-1}\frac{n!(2k-1)!!}{\left(1-T(\zeta)\frac{e^\lambda-1-\lambda}{\lambda^2/2}\right)^k\zeta^n\lambda^{2k}}\right)=\Theta(n^{-r}\,\mathrm{MG}^{>0}_{n,k}).$$

It implies that the dominant term in the asymptotics of $\mathrm{CMG}_{n,k}$ is indeed $\mathrm{MG}^{>0}_{n,k}$, so

$$\mathrm{CMG}_{n,k}\sim\mathrm{MG}^{>0}_{n,k},$$

and its dominant asymptotic is reformulated in Lemma 8. Therefore, Equation (1) holds. The asymptotic expansions of the summands are derived in Lemma 7, and the result of the lemma follows by summation. □

6 Connected graphs with large excess

To derive the number of connected graphs $\mathrm{CSG}_{n,k}$, we will apply Lemma 1, which requires the enumeration of connected multigraphs without loops nor double edges. We actually obtain a stronger result: the generating function of connected multigraphs with a given number of loops and double edges (which is then set to zero). This result generalizes the one of Section 5, and we will follow the same steps.

6.1 Patchworks

We first need a technique to remove the loops and multiple edges from multigraph families. Our tool to do so is the inclusion-exclusion technique, in conjunction with the notion of *patchwork*. The role of patchworks is to capture the complex structures that loops and double edges can produce when they are "glued" together. Recall that $\mathrm{LD}(G)$ denotes the set of loops and double edges of a multigraph G, and $\mathrm{ld}(G)$ is the cardinality of this set.

Definition 4. *A* patchwork *with p parts $P=\{(V_1,E_1),\dots,(V_p,E_p)\}$ is a set of p pairs (vertices, edges) such that*

$$\mathrm{MG}(P)=(\cup_{i=1}^p V_i,\cup_{i=1}^p E_i)$$

is a multigraph, and each (V_i,E_i) is either a loop or a double edge of $\mathrm{MG}(P)$, i.e. $P\subset\mathrm{LD}(\mathrm{MG}(P))$. The number of parts of the patchwork is $|P|$. Its number of vertices $n(P)$, edges $m(P)$, and its excess $k(P)$ are the corresponding numbers for $\mathrm{MG}(P)$. See Figure 5.



Figure 5: A patchwork P of excess 2, and the multigraph $\mathrm{MG}(P)$. Observe that several patchworks can lead to the same multigraph. Here, $\mathrm{LD}(\mathrm{MG}(P)) \neq P$, since the double edge $(\{1,2\},\{(2,1,1),(1,2,3)\})$ is missing from P.

In particular, all pairs (V_i, E_i) are distinct, $\mathrm{MG}(P)$ has minimum degree at least 2, and two edges in E_i, E_j having the same label must link the same vertices. We use for patchwork generating functions the same conventions as for multigraphs, introducing an additional variable u to mark the number of parts

$$P(z,w,u) = \sum_{\text{patchwork } P} u^{|P|} \frac{w^{m(P)}}{2^{m(P)} m(P)!} \frac{z^{n(P)}}{n(P)!}.$$

Lemma 10. *The generating function of patchworks is equal to*

$$P(z,w,u) = \sum_{k\geq 0} P_k(zw,u) w^k, \qquad \text{where} \quad P_0(z,u) = e^{u\frac{z}{2} + u\frac{z^2}{4}}.$$

For each k, there is a polynomial $P_k^{>0}(z,u)$ such that $P_k(z,u) = P_0(z,u) P_k^{>0}(z,u)$.

Proof. A patchwork of excess 0 is a set of isolated loops and double edges (*i.e.* sharing no vertex with another loop or double edge), which explains the expression of $P_0(z,u)$. Let $P_k^{>0}$ denote the family of patchworks of excess k that contain no isolated loop or double edge. Each vertex of degree 2 then belongs to exactly one double edge and no loop. The number of such double edges is at most k, because each increases the global excess by 1. If we remove them, the corresponding multigraph has minimum degree at least 3 and excess at most k. According to Lemma 4, there is a finite number of such multigraphs, so the family $P_k^{>0}$ is finite, and its generating function $P_k^{>0}(z,u)$ is a polynomial. Since any patchwork of excess k is a set of isolated loops and double edges and a patchwork from $P_k^{>0}$, we have

$$P_k(z,u) = P_0(z,u) P_k^{>0}(z,u).$$

□

The previous lemma gives us all the information we will need in the next sections. The polynomials $P_k^\star$ can be computed by enumeration of all multigraphs with minimum degree at least 3. However, this is both inefficient and hard to compute. More explicit expressions are available in Appendix 8.2.

6.2 Exact enumeration

In this section, we derive an exact expression for the number $\mathrm{CSG}_{n,k}$ of connected graphs with n vertices and excess k, suitable for asymptotics analysis.

Theorem 6. *The generating function of* cores*, i.e. graphs with minimum degree at least* 2*, is*

$$\mathrm{Core}(z,w) = \sum_{m\geq 0} (2m)! [x^{2m}] P(ze^x, w, -1) e^{z(e^x - 1 - x)} \frac{w^m}{2^m m!}.$$

Proof. Let MCore denote the set of multicores, *i.e.* multigraphs with minimum degree at least 2, and set

$$\mathrm{MCore}(z,w,u) = \sum_{\text{multicore } G} u^{\mathrm{ld}(G)} \frac{w^{m(G)}}{2^{m(G)} m(G)!} \frac{z^{n(G)}}{n(G)!},$$

where $\mathrm{ld}(G)$ denotes the number of loops and double edges in G. According to Lemma 1, we have $\mathrm{Core}(z,w) = \mathrm{MCore}(z,w,0)$. To express the generating function of multicores, the inclusion-exclusion method (see (Flajolet and Sedgewick, 2009, Section III.7.4)) advises us to consider $\mathrm{MCore}(z,w,u+1)$ instead. This is the generating function of the set $\mathrm{MCore}^\star$ of multicores where each loop and double edge is either marked by u or left unmarked. The set of marked loops and double edges form, by definition, a patchwork. One can cut each unmarked edge into two labelled half-edges. Observe that the degree constraint implies that each vertex outside the patchwork contains at least two half-edges. Reversely, as illustrated in Figure 6, any multicore from $\mathrm{MCore}^\star$ can be uniquely build following the steps:

1. start with a patchwork P, which will be the final set of marked loops and double edges,
2. add a set of isolated vertices,
3. add to each vertex a set of labelled half-edges, such that each isolated vertex receives at least two of them. The total number of half-edges must be even, and is denoted by $2m$,
4. add to the patchwork the m edges obtained by linking the half-edges with consecutive labels (1 with 2, 3 with 4 and so on).



Figure 6: Left, a multigraph from $\mathrm{MCore}^\star$ (the marked loops and double edges are bold). Right, the corresponding multigraph with labelled half-edges, build in step 3 of the proof of Theorem 6.

Observe that a relabelling of the vertices (resp. the edges) occurs at step 2 (resp. 4). This construction implies, by application of the species theory (Bergeron et al. (1997)) or the symbolic method (Flajolet and Sedgewick (2009)), the generating function relation

$$\mathrm{MCore}(z,w,u+1) = \sum_{m\geq 0} (2m)![x^{2m}]P(ze^x,w,u)e^{z(e^x-1-x)}\frac{w^m}{2^m m!}.$$

For $u=-1$, applying Lemma 1, we obtain the expression of $\mathrm{Core}(z,w) = \mathrm{MCore}(z,w,0)$. □

Any graph where no component is a tree can be built starting with a core, and replacing each vertex with a rooted tree. We apply the previous results to investigate graphs where all components have positive excess, *i.e.* that contain neither trees nor unicycles. This is the key new ingredient in our proof of Theorem 1.

Lemma 11. *The generating function of graphs with excess k where each component has positive excess is*

$$\mathrm{SG}_k^{>0}(z) = \sum_{\ell=0}^{k}(2(k-\ell)-1)!![x^{2(k-\ell)}]\frac{P_\ell(T(z)e^x,-1)e^{-V(z)}}{\left(1-T(z)\frac{e^x-1-x}{x^2/2}\right)^{k-\ell+1/2}}.$$

It is coefficient-wise smaller than

$$\mathrm{MG}_k^{>0}(z) = (2k-1)!![x^{2k}]\frac{e^{-MV(z)}}{\left(1-T(z)\frac{e^x-1-x}{x^2/2}\right)^{k+1/2}}.$$

Proof. In the expression of the generating function of cores, after developing the exponential as a sum over n and applying the change of variable $m \leftarrow k+n$, we obtain

$$\mathrm{Core}(z,w) = \sum_{k\geq 0}[x^{2k}]P(ze^x,w,-1)\left(\sum_{n\geq 0}\frac{(2(k+n))!}{2^{k+n}(k+n)!}\frac{\left(zw\frac{e^x-1-x}{x^2}\right)^n}{n!}\right)w^k.$$

The sum over n is replaced by its closed form

$$\mathrm{Core}(z,w) = \sum_{k\geq 0} [x^{2k}] P(ze^x, w, -1) \frac{(2k-1)!!}{\left(1 - zw\frac{e^x-1-x}{x^2/2}\right)^{k+1/2}} w^k.$$

Lemma 10 is applied to expand $P(ze^x, w, -1)$. The generating function of cores of excess k is then

$$\mathrm{Core}_k(z) = [y^k]\,\mathrm{Core}(z/y, y) = \sum_{\ell=0}^{k} (2(k-\ell)-1)!![x^{2(k-\ell)}] \frac{P_\ell(ze^x, -1)}{\left(1 - z\frac{e^x-1-x}{x^2/2}\right)^{k-\ell+1/2}}.$$

A core of excess k where the vertices are replaced by rooted trees can be uniquely decomposed as a set of unicycles, and a graph of excess k where each component has a positive excess, so

$$\mathrm{Core}_k(T(z)) = e^{V(z)}\,\mathrm{SG}_k^{>0}(z).$$

This leads to the results stated in the lemma, after division by $e^{V(z)}$. According to Lemma 1, the generating function $\mathrm{MG}^{>0}(z,w)$ of multigraphs where all components have positive excess dominates coefficient-wise $\mathrm{SG}^{>0}(z,w)$, so $\mathrm{MG}_k^{>0}(z) = [y^k]\,\mathrm{MG}^{>0}(z/y, y)$ dominates coefficient-wise $\mathrm{SG}_k^{>0}(z)$. □

We finally prove an exact expression for the number of connected graphs, which asymptotics is derived in Section 6.4.

Theorem 7. *For $k > 0$, the number of connected graphs with n vertices and excess k is*

$$\mathrm{CSG}_{n,k} = n![z^n]\,\mathrm{CSG}_k(z) = \sum_{q=1}^{k} \frac{(-1)^{q+1}}{q} \sum_{\substack{k_1+\cdots+k_q=k \\ \forall j,\ 1\leq k_j\leq k-q+1}} n![z^n] \prod_{j=1}^{q} \mathrm{SG}_{k_j}^{>0}(z).$$

Proof. Each graph in $\mathrm{SG}^{>0}$ is a set of connected graphs with positive excess, so

$$\sum_{\ell\geq 0} \mathrm{SG}_\ell^{>0}(z) y^\ell = e^{\sum_{k>0} \mathrm{CSG}_k(z) y^k}.$$

Observe that $\mathrm{SG}_0^{>0}(z) = 1$. Indeed, the only graph of excess 0 where all components have positive excess is the empty graph (this can also be deduced by calculus from Lemma 11). Taking the logarithm of the previous expression and extracting the coefficient $[y^k]$, we obtain

$$\mathrm{CSG}_k(z) = [y^k] \log\left(1 + \sum_{\ell\geq 1} \mathrm{SG}_\ell^{>0}(z) y^\ell\right),$$

which leads to the result by expansion of the logarithm and extraction of the coefficient $[z^n]$. Observe that $q \leq k$ because each k_j is at least 1, and $k_j \leq k - q + 1$ for the same reason. □

6.3 Asymptotic expansion of connected graphs with fixed excess

Combining Lemma 11 and Theorem 7, we obtain the following expression for the number $\mathrm{CSG}_{n,k}$ of connected graphs with n vertices and excess $k > 0$

$$2^{n+k}(n+k)! \sum_{q=1}^{k} \frac{(-1)^{q+1}}{q} \sum_{\substack{k_1+\cdots+k_q=k \\ \forall j,\ 1\leq k_j\leq k-q+1}} n![z^n] \prod_{j=1}^{q} \sum_{\ell=0}^{k_j} (2(k_j-\ell)-1)!![x^{2(k_j-\ell)}] \frac{P_\ell(T(z)e^x, -1)e^{-V(z)}}{\left(1 - T(z)\frac{e^x-1-x}{x^2/2}\right)^{k_j-\ell+1/2}}.$$

For any positive fixed k, the domains of the sums and products are finite. The coefficient extraction

$$[x^{2(k_j-\ell)}]\frac{P_\ell(T(z)e^x,-1)e^{-V(z)}}{\left(1-T(z)\frac{e^x-1-x}{x^2/2}\right)^{k_j-\ell+1/2}}$$

can be expressed as the evaluation at 0 of the $(2(k_j-\ell))$th derivative with respect to x of the function

$$\frac{P_\ell(T(z)e^x,-1)e^{-V(z)}}{\left(1-T(z)\frac{e^x-1-x}{x^2/2}\right)^{k_j-\ell+1/2}}.$$

Since $e^{-V(z)}=\sqrt{1-T(z)}e^{T(z)/2+T(z)^2/4}$ (Lemma 3), and there exists a polynomial $P^\star_\ell(z,u)$ such that

$$P_\ell(z,u)=P^\star_\ell(z,u)e^{uz/2+uz^2/4}$$

(Lemma 10 or Appendix 8.2), by recurrence on k_j, this is equal to

$$\frac{K^\star_k(T(z))}{(1-T(z))^{3k_j}},$$

for some computable polynomial $K^\star_k$. Applying a singularity analysis (see (Flajolet and Sedgewick, 2009, Section VI.4)), this provides a new proof of the result of Wright (1980) and Flajolet et al. (2004) on the asymptotic expansion of connected multigraphs with fixed excess (already expressed in Theorem 2).

6.4 Asymptotic expansion of connected graphs with large excess

In this section, we prove Theorem 1, deriving $\mathrm{CSG}_{n,k}$ up to a multiplicative factor $(1+\mathcal{O}(n^{-d}))$, where d is an arbitrary fixed integer. Our strategy is to express $\mathrm{CSG}_{n,k}$ as a sum of finitely many non-negligible terms, which asymptotic expansions are extracted using a saddle-point method. We will see that in the expression of $\mathrm{CSG}_{n,k}$ from Theorem 7, the dominant contribution comes from $q=1$, *i.e.*, applying Lemma 11,

$$\mathrm{CSG}_{n,k}\sim n![z^n]\,\mathrm{SG}_k^{>0}(z)=\sum_{\ell=0}^{k}n!(2(k-\ell)-1)!![z^nx^{2(k-\ell)}]\frac{P_\ell(T(z)e^x,-1)e^{-V(z)}}{\left(1-T(z)\frac{e^x-1-x}{x^2/2}\right)^{k-\ell+1/2}}.$$

In this expression, the dominant contribution will come from $\ell=0$. This means that a graph with n vertices, excess k, and without tree or unicycle components, is connected with high probability – a fact already proven by Erdős and Rényi (1960) and used by Pittel and Wormald (2005). Furthermore, its loops and double edges are typically disjoint, hence forming a patchwork of excess 0. We now derive the asymptotics $D_{n,k}$ of this dominant term, and will use it as a reference, to which the other terms will be compared.

Lemma 12. *When k/n tends toward a positive constant, we have the following asymptotics*

$$n!(2k-1)!![z^nx^{2k}]\frac{P_0(T(z)e^x,-1)e^{-V(z)}}{\left(1-T(z)\frac{e^x-1-x}{x^2/2}\right)^{k+1/2}}\sim\frac{n^{n+k}}{\sqrt{2\pi k}}\frac{\lambda^{-k}}{\left(\left(\frac{k}{n}+1\right)^2-\frac{\lambda^2}{4}\right)^{n/2}}\frac{\left(\frac{\lambda}{2}-\frac{k}{n}\right)e^{-\left(1+\frac{k}{2n}\right)\lambda}}{\sqrt{\frac{\lambda^2}{4}\frac{n}{k}-\frac{k}{n}-1}},$$

where the right-hand side is denoted by $D_{n,k}$, and λ is the unique positive solution of $\frac{\lambda}{2}\frac{e^\lambda+1}{e^\lambda-1}=\frac{k}{n}+1$. In particular, introducing the value ζ characterized by $T(\zeta)=\frac{\lambda}{e^\lambda-1}$, we have

$$D_{n,k}=\Theta\left(\frac{1}{n}\frac{n!(2k-1)!!}{\left(1-T(\zeta)\frac{e^\lambda-1-\lambda}{\lambda^2/2}\right)^k\zeta^n\lambda^{2k}}\right).$$

Proof. The proof is the same as for Lemmas 7 and 8. Injecting the formulas for $P_0(z,u)$ and $V(z)$ derived in Lemmas 10, 3, the expression becomes

$$n!(2k-1)!![z^n x^{2k}]A(z,x)B(z,x)^k,$$

with

$$B(z,x) = \left(1 - T(z)\frac{e^x - 1 - x}{x^2/2}\right)^{-1}$$

and

$$A(z,x) = e^{-\frac{T(z)e^x}{2} - \frac{T(z)^2 e^{2x}}{4} + \frac{T(z)}{2} + \frac{T(z)^2}{4}}\sqrt{(1-T(z))B(z,x)}.$$

We recognize the classic *large powers* setting, and a bivariate saddle-point method (see *e.g.* Bender and Richmond (1999)) is applied to extract the asymptotics, which implies the second result of the lemma:

$$n!(2k-1)!![z^n x^{2k}]A(z,x)B(z,x)^k \sim n!(2k-1)!!\frac{A(\zeta,\lambda)}{2\pi k\sqrt{\det(H(\zeta,\lambda))}}\frac{B(\zeta,\lambda)^k}{\zeta^n \lambda^{2k}}$$

where ζ, λ and the 2×2 matrix $(H_{i,j}(z,x))_{1\le i,j\le 2}$ are characterized by the equations

$$\frac{\zeta\partial_\zeta B(\zeta,\lambda)}{B(\zeta,\lambda)} = \frac{n}{k}, \quad \frac{\lambda\partial_\lambda B(\zeta,\lambda)}{B(\zeta,\lambda)} = 2, \quad H_{i,j}(e^{t_1},e^{t_2}) = \partial_{t_i}\partial_{t_j}\log\left(B(e^{t_1},e^{t_2})\right).$$

The first result follows by application of the same simplification rules already applied in Lemma 8:

$$\begin{aligned} H_{1,1} &= \tfrac{1}{(1-T(\zeta))^2}\tfrac{n}{k} + \tfrac{n^2}{k^2}, \\ H_{1,2} &= H_{2,1} = \tfrac{2}{1-T(\zeta)} + \tfrac{2n}{k}, \\ H_{2,2} &= \lambda(1-T(\zeta))\tfrac{n}{k} + 2\lambda, \end{aligned} \qquad \begin{aligned} MV(z) &= \tfrac{1}{2}\log\left(\tfrac{1}{1-T(z)}\right), \\ T(\zeta) &= \tfrac{k}{n} + 1 - \tfrac{\lambda}{2}, \\ \zeta &= T(\zeta)e^{-T(\zeta)} = \left(\tfrac{k}{n} + 1 - \tfrac{\lambda}{2}\right)e^{-\frac{k}{n} - 1 + \frac{\lambda}{2}}, \\ e^\lambda &= 1 + \tfrac{\lambda}{\frac{k}{n} + 1 - \frac{\lambda}{2}}, \end{aligned}$$

which implies, in particular,

$$e^{-\frac{T(\zeta)e^\lambda}{2} - \frac{T(\zeta)^2 e^{2\lambda}}{4} + \frac{T(\zeta)}{2} + \frac{T(\zeta)^2}{4}} = e^{-\left(1 + \frac{k}{2n}\right)\lambda}.$$

□

Observe the similitude with the expression of the dominant term of connected multigraphs

$$n!2^{n+k}(n+k)![z^n]\,\mathrm{MG}_k^{>0}(z) = n!2^{n+k}(n+k)![z^n x^{2k}]\frac{\sqrt{1-T(z)}}{\left(1 - T(z)\frac{e^x-1-x}{x^2/2}\right)^{k+1/2}},$$

which asymptotics was derived in Lemma 8. The only differences are the terms $2^{n+k}(n+k)!$ and

$$e^{-\frac{T(z)e^x}{2} - \frac{T(z)^2 e^{2x}}{4} + \frac{T(z)}{2} + \frac{T(z)^2}{4}}.$$

In the expression of $\mathrm{CSG}_{n,k}$ from Theorem 7, the product over j has the following simple bound.

Lemma 13. *When k/n tends to a positive constant, for any integer composition $k_1 + \cdots + k_q = k$, we have*

$$n![z^n]\prod_{j=1}^{q}\mathrm{SG}_{k_j}^{>0}(z) = \frac{\prod_{j=1}^q (2k_j-1)!!}{(2k-1)!!}\mathcal{O}(nD_{n,k}),$$

where the big $\mathcal{O}$ is independent of q.

Proof. According to Lemma 11, we have

$$n![z^n]\prod_{j=1}^{q}\mathrm{SG}_{k_j}^{>0}(z)\le n![z^n]\prod_{j=1}^{q}\mathrm{MG}_{k_j}^{>0}(z)=\prod_{j=1}^{q}n!(2k_j-1)!![z^n x^{2k_j}]\frac{e^{-MV(z)}}{\left(1-T(z)\frac{e^x-1-x}{x^2/2}\right)^{k_j+1/2}}.$$

Applying a classic bound (see *e.g.* (Flajolet and Sedgewick, 2009, Section VIII.2)), we obtain for all j

$$[z^n x^{2k_j}]\frac{e^{-MV(z)}}{\left(1-T(z)\frac{e^x-1-x}{x^2/2}\right)^{k_j+1/2}}\le\frac{e^{-MV(\zeta)}}{\left(1-T(\zeta)\frac{e^\lambda-1-\lambda}{\lambda^2/2}\right)^{k_j+1/2}\zeta^n\lambda^{2k_j}}.$$

Taking the product over j and using the facts $k_1+\cdots+k_q=k$ and $e^{-MV(\zeta)}<1$ leads to

$$n![z^n]\prod_{j=1}^{q}\mathrm{SG}_{k_j}^{>0}(z)\le\frac{n!\prod_{j=1}^{q}(2k_j-1)!!}{\left(1-T(\zeta)\frac{e^\lambda-1-\lambda}{\lambda^2/2}\right)^{k+1/2}\zeta^n\lambda^{2k}}.$$

The result follows, as a consequence of the bound derived in Lemma 12. □

We now identify, in the expression of $\mathrm{CSG}_{n,k}$ from Theorem 7, some negligible terms.

Lemma 14. *For any fixed d (resp. fixed d and q), the following two terms are $\mathcal{O}(n^{-d}D_{n,k})$*

$$\sum_{q=d+5}^{k}\frac{(-1)^{q-1}}{q}\sum_{\substack{k_1+\cdots+k_q=k\\ \forall j,\ 1\le k_j\le k-q+1}}\prod_{j=1}^{q}n![z^n]\,\mathrm{SG}_{k_j}^{>0}(z),\qquad\sum_{j\ge0}\sum_{\substack{k_1+\cdots+k_q=k\\ \forall j,\ 1\le k_j\le k-d-4-j}}\prod_{j=1}^{q}n![z^n]\,\mathrm{SG}_{k_j}^{>0}(z).$$

Proof. This lemma is the graph counterpart of Lemma 9, which treated multigraphs. According to Lemma 13, it is sufficient to prove that the sequence

$$S_{q,d,k}=\sum_{\substack{k_1+\cdots+k_q=k\\ \forall j,\ 0\le k_j\le k-d}}\frac{\prod_{j=1}^{q}(2k_j-1)!!}{(2k-1)!!}$$

satisfies, for any fixed d (resp. when d and q are fixed),

$$\sum_{q=d+5}^{k}\frac{1}{q}S_{q,q-1,k}=\mathcal{O}(k^{-d-1})\qquad\text{and}\qquad\sum_{j\ge0}S_{q,d+4+j,k}=\mathcal{O}(k^{-d-1}).$$

Those proofs are available in Appendix 8.1. □

Using the previous lemma, we remove the negligible terms from $\mathrm{CSG}_{n,k}$ and simplify its expression.

Lemma 15. *There exist computable polynomials $K_{q,r}$ such that, when k/n has a positive limit,*

$$\mathrm{CSG}_{n,k}=\sum_{q=1}^{d+4}(-1)^{q-1}\sum_{r=q-1}^{d+3}n![z^n]\,\mathrm{SG}_{k-r}^{>0}(z)\frac{K_{q,r}(T(z))}{(1-T(z))^{3r}}\big(1+\mathcal{O}(n^{-d})\big).\tag{4}$$

Proof. The previous lemma proves that in the expression of $\mathrm{CSG}_{n,k}$ from Theorem 7, we need only consider the terms corresponding to $q\le d+4$, and $k-(d+4)\le\max_j(k_j)\le k$. Since $k_1+\cdots+k_q=k$, when k is large enough and d is fixed, there is at most one k_j between $k-d$ and k. Up to a symmetry of order q, we can thus assume $k_q=\max_j(k_j)$, and introduce $r=k-k_q$

$$\mathrm{CSG}_{n,k}=\sum_{q=1}^{d+4}(-1)^{q-1}\sum_{r=q-1}^{d+3}n![z^n]\,\mathrm{SG}_{k-r}^{>0}(z)\sum_{\substack{k_1+\cdots+k_{q-1}=r\\ \forall j,\ k_j\ge1}}\prod_{j=1}^{q-1}\mathrm{SG}_{k_j}^{>0}(z)\big(1+\mathcal{O}(n^{-d})\big).$$

According to Lemma 5, there exist computable polynomials $(K_k)_{k\geq 1}$ such that

$$\sum_{\substack{k_1+\cdots+k_{q-1}=r\\ \forall j,\ k_j\geq 1}}\prod_{j=1}^{q-1}\mathrm{SG}_{k_j}^{>0}(z)=\sum_{\substack{k_1+\cdots+k_{q-1}=r\\ \forall j,\ k_j\geq 1}}\prod_{j=1}^{q-1}\frac{K_{k_j}(T(z))}{(1-T(z))^{3k_j}}=\frac{\sum_{\substack{k_1+\cdots+k_{q-1}=r\\ \forall j,\ k_j\geq 1}}\prod_{j=1}^{q-1}K_{k_j}(T(z))}{(1-T(z))^{3r}},$$

and the numerator is the polynomial $K_{q,r}$ evaluated at $T(z)$. □

The next lemma proves that the terms corresponding to patchworks with a large excess are negligible. The difficulty here is that we can only manipulate the generating functions of patchworks of finite excess.

Lemma 16. *When k/n has a positive limit and q, r are fixed, then*

$$n![z^n]\,\mathrm{SG}_{k-r}^{>0}(z)\frac{K_{q,r}(T(z))}{(1-T(z))^{3r}}$$

is equal to

$$\sum_{\ell=0}^{d-1}n!(2(k-r-\ell)-1)!![z^nx^{2(k-r-\ell)}]\frac{P_\ell(T(z)e^x,-1)e^{-V(z)}}{\left(1-T(z)\frac{e^x-1-x}{x^2/2}\right)^{k-r-\ell+1/2}}\frac{K_{q,r}(T(z))}{(1-T(z))^{3r}}\left(1+\mathcal{O}(n^{-d})\right).$$

Proof. We only present the proof of the equality

$$n![z^n]\,\mathrm{SG}_{k}^{>0}(z)=\sum_{\ell=0}^{d-1}n!(2(k-\ell)-1)!![z^nx^{2(k-\ell)}]\frac{P_\ell(T(z)e^x,-1)e^{-V(z)}}{\left(1-T(z)\frac{e^x-1-x}{x^2/2}\right)^{k-\ell+1/2}}\left(1+\mathcal{O}(n^{-d})\right).$$

This corresponds to the case $q=1$ and $r=0$ of the lemma, the general proof being identical. Given a finite family $\mathcal{F}$ of multigraphs, let $\mathrm{IE}_{<d}(\mathcal{F})$ denote the bounded inclusion-exclusion operator

$$\mathrm{IE}_{<d}(\mathcal{F})=\sum_{G\in\mathcal{F}}\ \sum_{P\subset\mathrm{LD}(G),\ k(P)<d}(-1)^{|P|}.$$

Let $\mathrm{MG}_{n,k}^{>0}$ denote the set of multigraphs with n vertices, excess k, without tree or unicycle component. Its subset $\mathrm{MG}_{n,k,<d}^{>0}$ (resp. $\mathrm{MG}_{n,k,\geq d}^{>0}$) corresponds to multigraphs G with maximal patchwork $\mathrm{LD}(G)$ of excess less than d (resp. at least d). Given the decomposition $\mathrm{MG}_{n,k}^{>0}=\mathrm{MG}_{n,k,<d}^{>0}\uplus\mathrm{MG}_{n,k,\geq d}^{>0}$, we have

$$\mathrm{IE}_{<d}(\mathrm{MG}_{n,k}^{>0})=\mathrm{IE}_{<d}(\mathrm{MG}_{n,k,<d}^{>0})+\mathrm{IE}_{<d}(\mathrm{MG}_{n,k,\geq d}^{>0}).\tag{5}$$

Working as in the proof of Lemma 11, we obtain

$$\mathrm{IE}_{<d}(\mathrm{MG}_{n,k}^{>0})=\sum_{\ell=0}^{d-1}n!(2(k-\ell)-1)!![z^nx^{2(k-\ell)}]\frac{P_\ell(T(z)e^x,-1)e^{-V(z)}}{\left(1-T(z)\frac{e^x-1-x}{x^2/2}\right)^{k-\ell+1/2}}.$$

Since $(2(k-\ell)-1)!!=\Theta(n^{-\ell}(2k-1)!!)$, applying the same saddle-point method as in Lemma 12, the ℓth term of the sum is a $\Theta(n^{-\ell}D_{n,k})$. By inclusion-exclusion $\mathrm{IE}_{<d}(\mathrm{MG}_{n,k,<d}^{>0})=\mathrm{SG}_{n,k}^{>0}$ so, injecting those results in Equation (5),

$$\mathrm{SG}_{n,k}^{>0}=\sum_{\ell=0}^{d-1}n!(2(k-\ell)-1)!![z^nx^{2(k-\ell)}]\frac{P_\ell(T(z)e^x,-1)e^{-V(z)}}{\left(1-T(z)\frac{e^x-1-x}{x^2/2}\right)^{k-\ell+1/2}}-\mathrm{IE}_{<d}(\mathrm{MG}_{n,k,\geq d}^{>0}).$$

We now bound $|\,\mathrm{IE}_{<d}(\mathrm{MG}_{n,k,\geq d}^{>0})|$. Any multigraph from $\mathrm{MG}_{n,k,\geq d}^{>0}$ contains, as a subgraph, a patchwork of excess d. Thus, $|\,\mathrm{MG}_{n,k,\geq d}^{>0}\,|$ is bounded by the number of multigraphs from $\mathrm{MG}_{n,k}^{>0}$ where a patchwork of

excess d is distinguished. If, in any such multigraph, we mark another patchwork of excess less than d – which might well intersect the patchwork previously distinguished – we obtain the bound

$$|\operatorname{IE}_{<d}(\mathrm{MG}^{>0}_{n,k,\geq d})| \leq \sum_{\ell=0}^{d-1} n!(2(k-d-\ell)-1)!![z^n x^{2(k-d)}] \frac{P_d(T(z)e^x,2)P_\ell(T(z)e^x,1)}{\left(1-T(z)\frac{e^x-1-x}{x^2/2}\right)^{k-d-\ell+1/2}},$$

where the second argument of P_d is a 2, because each loop and double edge of the distinguished patchwork can be either marked or left unmarked. By the same saddle-point argument, this is a $\mathcal{O}(n^{-d}D_{n,k})$. □

Combining Lemmas 15 and 16, the number of connected graphs with n vertices and excess k is expressed as a sum of finitely many terms (since d is fixed)

$$\mathrm{CSG}_{n,k} = \sum_{q=1}^{d+4}(-1)^{q-1} \sum_{r=q-1}^{d+3}\sum_{\ell=0}^{d-1} n!(2(k-r-\ell)-1)!![z^n x^{2k}] A_{q,r,\ell}(z,x)B(z,x)^k\left(1+\mathcal{O}(n^{-d})\right), \tag{6}$$

where

$$B(z,x) = \left(1-T(z)\frac{e^x-1-x}{x^2/2}\right)^{-1}$$

and

$$A_{q,r,\ell}(z,x) = \frac{x^{2(r+\ell)}P_\ell(T(z)e^x,-1)e^{-V(z)}}{\left(1-T(z)\frac{e^x-1-x}{x^2/2}\right)^{-r-\ell+1/2}} \frac{K_{q,r}(T(z))}{(1-T(z))^{3r}}.$$

The asymptotics expansion of each summand is then extracted, applying the same saddle-point method as in Lemma 7. Its coefficient extraction is expressed as a Cauchy integral on a torus of radii (ζ,λ) (from Lemma 7),

$$[z^n x^{2k}]A_{q,r,\ell}(z,x)B(z,x)^k = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^2}\int_{\theta=-\pi}^{\pi}\int_{\varphi=-\pi}^{\pi} A_{q,r,\ell}(\zeta e^{i\theta},\lambda e^{i\varphi})\frac{B(\zeta e^{i\theta},\lambda e^{i\varphi})^k}{\zeta^n e^{ni\theta}\lambda e^{2ki\varphi}}d\theta d\varphi,$$

and its asymptotic expansion follows, by application of (Pemantle and Wilson, 2013, Theorem 5.1.2)

$$n!(2(k-r-\ell)-1)!![z^n x^{2k}]A_{q,r,\ell}(z,x)B(z,x)^k = n^{-r-\ell}D_{n,k}\left(b_0+\cdots+b_{d-1}n^{-d-1}+\mathcal{O}(n^{-d})\right),$$

where the (b_ℓ) are computable constants, and the factorials have been replaced by their asymptotic expansions

$$(2(k-r-\ell)-1)!! = \Theta(n^{-r-\ell}(2k-1)!!).$$

The summand corresponding to q, r, ℓ is a $\Theta(n^{-r-\ell}D_{n,k})$. Hence, $D_{n,k}$ is the dominant term in the asymptotics of $\mathrm{CSG}_{n,k}$. Injecting those expansions in Equation (6) concludes the proof of Theorem 1.

7 Conclusion

Janson et al. (1993) and Flajolet et al. (2004) started their analysis of multigraphs and graphs with the expression of their generating functions

$$\mathrm{MG}(z,w) = \sum_{n\geq 0} e^{wn^2/2}\frac{z^n}{n!},$$

$$\mathrm{SG}(z,w) = \sum_{n\geq 0}(1+w)^{\binom{n}{2}}\frac{z^n}{n!}.$$

As already mentioned, any graph (resp. multigraph) can be uniquely decomposed as a set of trees, and a core (resp. multicore) where vertices are replaced by rooted trees. If the manipulations of generating functions

with negative exponents were following the same rules as their nonnegative counterparts, this decomposition would translate into the following generating function relations

$$\mathrm{MG}(z/y,y)=\sum_{n\geq 0}e^{yn^2/2}\frac{(z/y)^n}{n!}=e^{y^{-1}U(z)}\sum_{k\geq 0}(2k-1)!![x^{2k}]\frac{y^k}{\left(1-T(z)\frac{e^x-1-x}{x^2/2}\right)^{k+1/2}},$$

$$\mathrm{SG}(z/y,y)=\sum_{n\geq 0}(1+y)^{\binom{n}{2}}\frac{(z/y)^n}{n!}=e^{y^{-1}U(z)}\sum_{k\geq 0}\sum_{\ell=0}^{k}(2(k-\ell)-1)!![x^{2(k-\ell)}]\frac{P_\ell(T(z),-1)y^k}{\left(1-T(z)\frac{e^x-1-x}{x^2/2}\right)^{k-\ell+1/2}}.$$

The contribution of trees is then clearly separated from the rest, contrary to the first expressions. Those two relations might be of mathematical interest on their own (should their domain of validity be defined). It would be interesting to prove them analytically, continuing the work of Flajolet et al. (2004).

References

E. A. Bender and L. B. Richmond. Multivariate asymptotics for products of large powers with applications to lagrange inversion. *J. Combin. 6(1), Research Paper*, 8, 1999.

E. A. Bender, E. R. Canfield, and B. D. McKay. The asymptotic number of labeled connected graphs with a given number of vertices and edges. *Random Structures and Algorithm*, 1:129–169, 1990.

F. Bergeron, G. Labelle, and P. Leroux. *Combinatorial Species and Tree-like Structures*. Cambridge University Press, 1997.

G. Collet, E. de Panafieu, D. Gardy, B. Gittenberger, and V. Ravelomanana. Counting graphs with forbidden subgraphs. *work in progress*, 2016.

E. de Panafieu. *Analytic Combinatorics of Graphs, Hypergraphs and Inhomogeneous Graphs*. PhD thesis, Université Paris-Diderot, Sorbonne Paris-Cité, 2014.

E. de Panafieu. Enumeration and structure of inhomogeneous graphs. *proceedings of the International Conference on Formal Power Series and Algebraic Combinatorics (FPSAC), poster presentation*, page 12, 2015a.

E. de Panafieu. Phase transition of random non-uniform hypergraphs. *Journal of Discrete Algorithms*, 31 (0):26 – 39, 2015b.

E. de Panafieu. Counting connected graphs with large excess. *proceedings of the International Conference on Formal Power Series and Algebraic Combinatorics (Fpsac16)*, 2016.

E. de Panafieu and L. Ramos. Graphs with degree constraints. *proceedings of the Meeting on Analytic Algorithmics and Combinatorics (Analco16)*, 2016.

E. de Panafieu and V. Ravelomanana. Analytic description of the phase transition of inhomogeneous multigraphs. *European Journal of Combinatorics*, 2015.

P. Erdős and A. Rényi. On the evolution of random graphs. *Publication of the Mathematical Institute of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences*, 5:17, 1960.

P. Flajolet and R. Sedgewick. *Analytic Combinatorics*. Cambridge University Press, 2009.

P. Flajolet, D. E. Knuth, and B. Pittel. The first cycles in an evolving graph. *Discrete Mathematics*, 75 (1-3):167–215, 1989.

P. Flajolet, B. Salvy, and G. Schaeffer. Airy phenomena and analytic combinatorics of connected graphs. *Electronic Journal of Combinatorics*, 11(1), 2004.

S. Janson, D. E. Knuth, T. Łuczak, and B. Pittel. The birth of the giant component. *Random Structures and Algorithms*, 4(3):233–358, 1993.

T. Łuczak. On the number of sparse connected graphs. *Random Structures and Algorithms*, 2:171–173, 1990.

R. Pemantle and M. C. Wilson. *Analytic Combinatorics in Several Variables*. Cambridge University Press, New York, NY, USA, 2013.

B. Pittel and N. C. Wormald. Counting connected graphs inside-out. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B*, 93(2):127–172, 2005.

A. Rényi. On connected graphs I. *publication of the mathematical institute of the hungarian academy of sciences*, 4(159):385–388, 1959.

R. van der Hofstad and J. Spencer. Counting connected graphs asymptotically. *European Journal on Combinatorics*, 26(8):1294–1320, 2006.

E. M. Wright. The number of connected sparsely edged graphs III: Asymptotic results. *Journal of Graph Theory*, 4(4):393–407, 1980.

8 Appendix

8.1 Properties of $S_{q,d,k}$

The goal of this section is to prove Lemma 21, which is required for the proof of Lemma 14. We did not try to derive the tighter possible bounds. Instead, their quality has been sacrificed in order to simplify the proofs.

The proofs are guided by the observation that the argument of the sum defining $S_{q,d,k}$ is maximal when one of the k_j's is large (then the others remain small).

Lemma 17. *When d is fixed and k tends to infinity, we have*

$$\sum_{r=d}^{k-d} \frac{(2(k-r)-1)!!(2r-1)!!}{(2k-1)!!} = \mathcal{O}(k^{-d}).$$

Proof. Stirling's bounds

$$\sqrt{2\pi}\sqrt{n}e^{-n}n^n \leq n! \leq e\sqrt{n}e^{-n}n^n$$

imply

$$(2n-1)!! = \Theta(e^{-n}(2n)^n),$$

and hence

$$\frac{(2(k-r)-1)!!(2r-1)!!}{(2k-1)!!} = \Theta\left(\frac{(k-r)^{k-r}r^r}{k^k}\right).$$

Using the symmetry, we cut the sum in the expression of the lemma in two halves

$$\sum_{r=d}^{k-d} \frac{(2(k-r)-1)!!(2r-1)!!}{(2k-1)!!} \leq 2\sum_{r=d}^{k/2} \frac{(2(k-r)-1)!!(2r-1)!!}{(2k-1)!!}.$$

Injecting the previous relation, this implies

$$\sum_{r=d}^{k-d} \frac{(2(k-r)-1)!!(2r-1)!!}{(2k-1)!!} = \mathcal{O}\left(\sum_{r=d}^{k/2} \frac{(k-r)^{k-r} r^r}{k^k} \right) = \mathcal{O}\left(\sum_{r=d}^{k/2} \left(1-\frac{r}{k}\right)^{k-r} \left(\frac{r}{k}\right)^r \right).$$

Since $1 - r/k \leq 1$ and $r/k \leq 1/2$, we have

$$\sum_{r=d}^{k/2} \left(1-\frac{r}{k}\right)^{k-r} \left(\frac{r}{k}\right)^r \leq \sum_{r=d}^{k/2} \left(\frac{r}{k}\right)^d \left(\frac{r}{k}\right)^{r-d} \leq k^{-d} \sum_{r \geq d} \frac{r^d}{2^{r-d}} = \mathcal{O}(k^{-d}).$$

□

Lemma 18. *The sequence*

$$S_{q,d,k} = \sum_{\substack{k_1+\cdots+k_q=k \\ \forall j,\ 0 \leq k_j \leq k-d}} \frac{\prod_{j=1}^q (2k_j-1)!!}{(2k-1)!!}$$

satisfies $S_{q,d,k} \leq 3q$ for all large enough k, and any $q \leq k$ and d.

Proof. Since $S_{q,d,k} \leq S_{q,0,k}$, we focus on the case $d = 0$. Up to a symmetry of order q, we can assume $k_q = \max_j(k_j)$

$$S_{q,0,k} \leq q \sum_{k_q=k/q}^{k} \frac{(2k_q-1)!!}{(2k-1)!!} \sum_{\substack{k_1+\cdots+k_{q-1}=k-k_q \\ \forall j,\ 0 \leq k_j \leq k_q}} \prod_{j=1}^{q} (2k_j-1)!!.$$

We introduce $r = k - k_q$, and replace the second sum with $(2r-1)!! S_{q-1,2r-k,r}$

$$S_{q,0,k} \leq q \sum_{r=0}^{k(1-1/q)} \frac{(2(k-r)-1)!!(2r-1)!!}{(2k-1)!!} S_{q-1,2r-k,r}. \tag{7}$$

The biggest value reached by r is then at most $k-1$. Developing the first and last few terms, we obtain

$$S_{q,0,k} \leq q\Big(S_{q-1,k,0} + \frac{S_{q-1,k-1,1}}{2k-1} + \sum_{r=2}^{k-2} \frac{(2(k-r)-1)!!(2r-1)!!}{(2k-1)!!} S_{q-1,2r-k,r} + \frac{S_{q-1,k-2,k-1}}{2k-1} \Big). \tag{8}$$

We have

$$S_{q-1,k,0} \leq 1, \quad S_{q-1,k-1,1} \leq q, \quad S_{q-1,k-2,k-1} \leq \frac{2^k}{(2k-3)!!} = o(1).$$

We inject those relations in the previous inequality

$$\begin{aligned} S_{q,0,k} &\leq q \left(1 + \frac{q}{2k-1} + \sum_{r=2}^{k-2} \frac{(2(k-r)-1)!!(2r-1)!!}{(2k-1)!!} S_{q-1,k-r,r} + o(1) \right) \\ &\leq q \left(2 + \sum_{r=2}^{k-2} \frac{(2(k-r)-1)!!(2r-1)!!}{(2k-1)!!} S_{q-1,2r-k,r} + o(1) \right). \end{aligned}$$

Finally, we prove by recurrence $S_{q,0,k} \leq 3q$ for k large enough. For $q = 1$, we have $S_{1,0,k} = 1$, which initializes the recurrence. Let us assume that the recurrence holds for $q-1$, then $S_{q-1,2r-k,r} \leq S_{q-1,0,r} \leq 3q \leq 3k$, and

$$S_{q,0,k} \leq q \left(2 + \sum_{r=2}^{k-2} \frac{(2(k-r)-1)!!(2r-1)!!}{(2k-1)!!} 3k + o(1) \right).$$

We apply Lemma 17 to bound the sum

$$S_{q,0,k} \leq q(2 + \mathcal{O}(k^{-2})3k + o(1)),$$

which is not greater than $3q$ for k large enough. □

Lemma 19. *For any fixed d, k large enough and $q \leq k$, we have $S_{q,k-d,k} \leq 2^{-k}$.*

Proof. The expression of $S_{q,k-d,k}$ is

$$S_{q,k-d,k} = \sum_{\substack{k_1+\cdots+k_q=k \\ \forall j,\ 0\leq k_j\leq d}} \frac{\prod_{j=1}^{q}(2k_j-1)!!}{(2k-1)!!}.$$

Applying Stirling's formula, we bound the double factorials

$$C_1(2k)^k e^{-k} \leq (2k-1)!! \leq C_2(2k)^k e^{-k}$$

for some constant positive values C_1, C_2. This implies, when $k_1 + \cdots + k_q = k$,

$$\frac{\prod_{j=1}^{q}(2k_j-1)!!}{(2k-1)!!} \leq \frac{\prod_{j=1}^{q} C_2(2k_j)^{k_j} e^{-k_j}}{C_1(2k)^k e^{-k}} \leq \frac{C_2^q}{C_1}\left(\frac{d}{k}\right)^k \leq \frac{1}{C_1}\left(\frac{C_2 d}{k}\right)^k.$$

The cardinality of the set $\{(k_1,\ldots,k_q) \in [0,d]^q \mid k_1 + \cdots + k_q = k\}$ is at most d^q, which is not greater than d^k, so

$$S_{q,k-d,k} = \sum_{\substack{k_1+\cdots+k_q=k \\ \forall j,\ 0\leq k_j\leq d}} \frac{\prod_{j=1}^{q}(2k_j-1)!!}{(2k-1)!!} \leq \frac{1}{C_1}\left(\frac{C_2 d^2}{k}\right)^k.$$

The right hand-side is smaller than 2^{-k} when d is fixed and k is large enough. □

Lemma 20. *For any fixed d, all k large enough, and $q \leq k$, we have $S_{q,d,k} = \mathcal{O}(k^{-d+2})$ uniformly with respect to q.*

Proof. We start as in the proof of Lemma 18. Up to a symmetry of order q, we can assume $k_q = max_j(k_j)$, and introduce $r = k - k_q$. We obtain an inequality similar to (7)

$$S_{q,d,k} \leq q \sum_{r=d}^{k(1-1/q)} \frac{(2(k-r)-1)!!(2r-1)!!}{(2k-1)!!} S_{q-1,2r-k,r}.$$

We bound q by k and cut the sum into two parts

$$S_{q,d,k} \leq k\sum_{r=d}^{k-d} \frac{(2(k-r)-1)!!(2r-1)!!}{(2k-1)!!} S_{q-1,2r-k,r} + k\sum_{r=k-d+1}^{k-1} \frac{(2(k-r)-1)!!(2r-1)!!}{(2k-1)!!} S_{q-1,2r-k,r}.$$

The first sum is bounded by application of Lemmas 18 and 17

$$k\sum_{r=d}^{k-d} \frac{(2(k-r)-1)!!(2r-1)!!}{(2k-1)!!} S_{q-1,2r-k,r} \leq k\sum_{r=d}^{k-d} \frac{(2(k-r)-1)!!(2r-1)!!}{(2k-1)!!} 3k = \mathcal{O}(k^{-d+2}).$$

In the second sum, the fraction of factorials is bounded by 1

$$k\sum_{r=k-d+1}^{k-1} \frac{(2(k-r)-1)!!(2r-1)!!}{(2k-1)!!} S_{q-1,2r-k,r} \leq k\sum_{r=k-d+1}^{k-1} S_{q-1,2r-k,r}.$$

The sequence $S_{q,d,k}$ is decreasing with respect to d, so when r is greater than $k-d$, we have

$$S_{q-1,2r-k,r} = S_{q-1,r-(k-r),r} \leq S_{q-1,r-(d-1),r},$$

which is bounded by 2^{-r}, according to Lemma 19. This implies

$$k \sum_{r=k-d+1}^{k-1} S_{q-1,2r-k,r} \leq k \sum_{r=k-d+1}^{k-1} 2^{-r} \leq \frac{k}{2^{k-d}},$$

which is negligible compared to k^{-d+2}. □

Lemma 21. *For any fixed d (resp. when d and q are fixed), we have*

$$\sum_{q=d+5}^{k} \frac{1}{q} S_{q,q-1,k} = \mathcal{O}(k^{-d-1}) \qquad \text{and} \qquad \sum_{j\geq 0} S_{q,d+4+j,k} = \mathcal{O}(k^{-d-1}).$$

Proof. Since the sequence $S_{q,d,k}$ is decreasing with respect to d, we have, when q is at least $d+5$,

$$S_{q,q-1,k} \leq S_{q,d+4,k},$$

which is a $\mathcal{O}(k^{-d-2})$ according to Lemma 20. Hence,

$$\sum_{q=d+5}^{k} \frac{1}{q} S_{q,q-1,k} \leq k S_{q,d+4,k} = \mathcal{O}(k^{-d-1}).$$

In the second sum of the lemma, the summand vanishes when $j \geq k$, so

$$\sum_{j\geq 0} S_{q,d+4+j,k} \leq k S_{q,d+4,k} = \mathcal{O}(k^{-d-1}).$$

□

In my opinion, the proofs of this subsection are elementary, but too complicated compared to the simplicity of the result. More elegant proofs might take advantage of the integral representation

$$(2k-1)!! = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} t^{2k} e^{-t^2/2} dt.$$

8.2 Explicit expressions for the generating functions of patchworks

The computation of the asymptotic expansion of connected graphs, derived in Theorem 1, requires the computation of the generating functions $(P_k(z,u))$ of patchworks of excess k. In Lemma 10, we proved the existence of computable polynomials $P_k^{>0}(z,u)$ (generating functions of the patchworks of excess k that contain neither isolated loops nor isolated double edges) such that

$$P_k(z,u) = e^{uz/2+uz^2/4} P_k^{>0}(z,u).$$

Although computable, the expressions of those polynomials were far from explicit, and relied on the enumeration of all multigraphs with excess k and minimum degree at least 3. In this appendix, we derive a formula that allows their computation, using a computer algebra system.

Lemma 22. *Let the generating function of graphs be denoted by*

$$\mathrm{SG}(z,w)=\sum_{n\geq 0}(1+w)^{\binom{n}{2}}\frac{z^n}{n!}.$$

The generating function of patchworks is then equal to

$$P(z,w,u)=\mathrm{SG}\left(ze^{uw/2},\mathrm{SG}(w,u)e^{-w}-1\right)e^{-z}.$$

Proof. Let $\mathcal{D}$ denote the family of patchworks on two vertices $\{1,2\}$ that contains only double edges (*i.e.* no loop). Two parts of such a patchwork P may share at most one edge (since all parts are distinct). We now describe a bijection between $\mathcal{D}$ and the non-empty graphs without isolated vertices. Let P denote a patchwork from $\mathcal{D}$, and G the corresponding graph:

- each edge of $\mathrm{MG}(P)$ is represented by a vertex of G,
- each part of P is a double edge, and corresponds to an edge of G.

There are no loops in G because each double edge of P contains two distinct edges. There are no multiple edges in G because the parts of P are distinct. No vertex of G can be isolated since all edges of P belong to at least one part. The generating function of non-empty graphs without isolated vertices is

$$\mathrm{SG}(z,w)e^{-z}-1,$$

so the generating function of $\mathcal{D}$ is (without taking into account the two vertices)

$$\mathrm{SG}(w,u)e^{-w}-1.$$

Any patchwork where a set of isolated vertices has been added can be uniquely described as a graph G, where each edge is replaced with a patchwork from $\mathcal{D}$, and a set of loops is added to each vertex. Therefore, the generating function of patchworks satisfies

$$P(z,w,u)e^{z}=\mathrm{SG}\left(ze^{uw/2},\mathrm{SG}(w,u)e^{-w}-1\right).$$

□

According to Lemma 10, generating function of the patchworks of excess k that contain neither isolated loops nor isolated double edges is a polynomial, equal to

$$P_k^{>0}(z,u)=[y^k]P(z/y,y,u)e^{-uz/2-uz^2/4}.$$

Those patchworks contain at most $k+2$ vertices, thus at most $2k+2$ edges. Those bounds are reached by the patchworks of Figure 7. As a consequence, we have

$$P_k^{>0}(z,u)=\left(\sum_{n=0}^{k+2}\left([z^nw^{k+n}]P(z,w,u)\right)z^n\right)e^{-uz/2-uz^2/4}\mod z^{k+3}\mod w^{2k+3}.$$

Replacing $P(z,w,u)$ with the formula derived in Lemma 22, we obtain an expression computable on a

computer algebra system. The first few terms are

$$
\begin{aligned}
P_0^{>0}(z,u) &= 1,\\
P_1^{>0}(z,u) &= \frac{1}{8}u^2z + \left(\frac{1}{12}u^3 + \frac{1}{2}u^2\right)z^2 + \frac{1}{8}u^2z^3,\\
P_2^{>0}(z,u) &= \frac{1}{48}u^3z + \left(\frac{1}{16}u^2 + \frac{17}{24}u^3 + \frac{155}{384}u^4 + \frac{1}{8}u^5 + \frac{1}{48}u^6\right)z^2 + \left(\frac{7}{16}u^3 + \frac{7}{48}u^4 + \frac{1}{96}u^5\right)z^3\\
&\quad + \left(\frac{1}{12}u^3 + \frac{9}{64}u^4 + \frac{1}{24}u^5 + \frac{1}{288}u^6\right)z^4,\\
P_3^{>0}(z,u) &= \frac{1}{384}u^4z + \left(\frac{3}{16}u^3 + \frac{17}{16}u^4 + \frac{2461}{1920}u^5 + \frac{47}{48}u^6 + \frac{25}{48}u^7 + \frac{3}{16}u^8 + \frac{1}{24}u^9 + \frac{1}{240}u^{10}\right)z^2\\
&\quad + \left(\frac{1}{12}u^3 + \frac{377}{384}u^4 + \frac{119}{192}u^5 + \frac{195}{1024}u^6 + \frac{7}{192}u^7 + \frac{1}{384}u^8\right)z^3\\
&\quad + \left(\frac{43}{96}u^4 + \frac{1}{2}u^5 + \frac{625}{2304}u^6 + \frac{443}{4608}u^7 + \frac{1}{48}u^8 + \frac{1}{576}u^9\right)z^4\\
&\quad + \left(\frac{7}{96}u^4 + \frac{61}{192}u^5 + \frac{443}{3072}u^6 + \frac{1}{36}u^7 + \frac{7}{2304}u^8\right)z^5.
\end{aligned}
$$



Figure 7: A patchwork of excess k that maximizes the number of vertices $(k+2)$ and edges $(2k+2)$.